DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 203 908 JC 810 336

AUTHOR Lapin, Joel D.
TITLE Exemplary Organizational and Programmatic Linkages between Publicly Funded Community Colleges and CETA Prime Sponsors: Models for Maryland. Final Report: CETA/Community College Interface Research Project.
INSTITUTION Catonsville Community Coll., Md.
SPONS AGENCY Maryland State Dept. of Human Resources, Baltimore.
PUB DATE May 81
NOTE 99p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education: *Agency Role: *College Role: *Community Colleges: Cooperative Programs: *Educational Cooperation: *Educational Finance: Educational Responsibility: Employment Programs: Models: Organizational Communication: *Program Administration: Program Effectiveness: Program Evaluation: Questionnaires: Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Comprehensive Employment and Training Act: Maryland

ABSTRACT

Based on a nationwide study of the fiscal and administrative factors responsible for the maintenance of exemplary linkages between Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) prime sponsors and community colleges, this monograph presents guidelines for the development of cooperative relations between CETA and Maryland's community colleges. After introductory material explaining study methodology, Chapter I points to two sets of factors upon which model linkages are based: seven of these are the shared responsibility of the college and sponsor (e.g., choosing effective liaisons) and five are more likely to be achieved within the college (e.g., the development of manpower-related courses). Chapter II first reviews principles of adult learning and then discusses the division of responsibility between CETA and the college for program functions, including student and program evaluation, basic skills instruction, provision of support services, technical skills training, and job placement and follow-up. While unable to identify an optimal model for fiscal linkages, Chapter III does indicate that both the colleges and the sponsors should improve budgeting, become familiar with each other's fiscal regulations, recognize grant monies awarded to CETA students, and evaluate the merits of class instruction vs. individual referrals. Study questions and findings are appended. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED203908

FINAL REPORT

CETA/Community College Interface Research Project

"Exemplary Organizational and Programmatic Linkages between Publicly Funded Community Colleges and CETA Prime Sponsors: Models for Maryland"

Prepared for:

State of Maryland
Department of Human Resources
Training and Employment Office

Submitted May, 1981

Prepared by:

Joel D. Lapin, Director
CETA/Community College
Interface Research Project
Catonsville Community College
Catonsville, Maryland 21228

JC 810336

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joel D. Lapin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

catonsville community college

800 south rolling road · baltimore county, maryland 21228

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the Maryland Department of Human Resources, Training and Employment Office, and local CETA prime sponsors for their sponsorship of and cooperation with this research. The cooperation of Maryland community colleges is also appreciated.

A special note of thanks to the many CETA and community college personnel in Massachusetts, California, Michigan and South Carolina for their insights, advice and suggestions.

Finally, a particular note of appreciation to Dr. Philip Ringle and Professor Donald Jansiewicz of Catonsville Community College for their observations and editorial assistance.

Funding for this document was provided through the
Department of Labor,
Maryland Department of Human Resources,
Training and Employment Office
under the
Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA)
Governor's Special Grant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES 1.

RESEARCH DESIGN 2.

CHAPTER ONE 3.
Model One: Building and Strengthening Linkages Between CETA and Community Colleges

CHAPTER TWO 21.
Model Two: CETA Programmatic Functions in Maryland Community Colleges

CHAPTER THREE 42.
Strengthening the Fiscal Linkage Between Maryland Community Colleges and Maryland CETA Prime Sponsors

BIBLIOGRAPHY 49.

APPENDICES

A. Experience Survey 50.

B. Research Questionnaires 56.

C. Questionnaire Responses and Analysis 74.

D. Interview Schedules 82.

E. Maryland State Board for Community Colleges Policy 4.9 COMAR 13.51.01.04H 93.

F. Maryland State Field Instructions CETA/Special Grant (S6) No. 5-80 95.

Introduction

The issues discussed in this paper stem from a research grant awarded to Catonsville Community College by the State of Maryland, Department of Human Resources, Training and Employment Office. The overall research effort has been to examine the organizational and operational linkages between selected CETA prime sponsors and corresponding publicly funded community colleges.

Research Objectives

The specific research objectives were to:

A. Identify and categorize selected existing exemplary programmatic linkages between CETA prime sponsors and corresponding publicly funded community colleges.

B. Analyze selected existing models and their implications to CETA prime sponsors, clients, and community colleges.

C. Develop a model system of programmatic linkages between CETA prime sponsors and community colleges which will allow for the most effective service delivery system to CETA clients.

D. Preparation of a handbook detailing objectives B and C to be distributed to CETA prime sponsors, state CETA planning offices in Maryland, and state departments of education.

E. Preparation of a video presentation to be used as a training aid.

Objectives A, B, C, and D are the subject of this paper and will be examined in the following pages.

Research Design

Data gathering began with a review of pertinent research literature. The first significant step in data gathering was the development and use of experience surveys (Appendix A). These structured interviews, conducted with individuals associated with community colleges and CETA in Maryland resulted in useful information on the nature of linkages and suggestions for change.

It became increasingly clear that the most appropriate research sample to employ was that of a purposive sample of exemplary linkages. An exemplary linkage is defined as a relationship which functions exceptionally well and is considered, both programmatically and fiscally, very successful. Exemplary linkages outside of Maryland were identified in consultation with CETA researchers and experts in academe and government. Additional and frank consultation with state community college board officials and state CETA personnel resulted in a consensus of exemplary linkages to be contacted. Community college personnel and CETA prime sponsor representatives were contacted and independently asked to evaluate their linkage. If either party indicated a less than outstanding programmatic and fiscal relationship, no further follow-up occurred. This enabled the researcher to omit the less distinguished linkages as well as to avoid those marked by conflict. Therefore, the final purposive sample consisted of linkages identified by themselves as well as by others as being exemplary.

Two separate research questionnaires (Appendix B) were developed and distributed to the purposive sample of CETA prime sponsors and community colleges identified as having exemplary linkages. The purposes of the questionnaires were to: (1) verify/document exemplary linkages and to provide very general information on perceptions of the strengths of linkages; and (2) to identify linkages to visit and representatives to interview. In total, 43 CETA prime sponsors were surveyed, 33 returned the questionnaire for a 77% response; 54 community colleges were surveyed, 40 returned the questionnaire for a 74% response. The numerical imbalance reflects CETA prime sponsor contracts with more than one community college. Analysis of questionnaire responses can be found in Appendix C.

Analysis of questionnaire responses and oral and written communications identified linkages to visit. In preparation for on-site visitation, a structured interview (Appendix D) was developed for use to interview appropriate community college personnel and CETA prime sponsor staff. This information has been synthesized and provides the basis for the models which are presented.

This report will develop two related models. Both models are offered in order to nurture a cooperative partnership between CETA and publicly funded community colleges in Maryland. The first chapter and model focuses on building and strengthening current CETA/community college linkages. The second chapter and model is aimed at developing a model programmatic linkage system. In each model a number of linkage needs will be proposed and developed.

These models represent a synthesis of various exemplary linkages researched in this study. The research did not reveal one universally adoptable model nor should the reader believe that a "single-best model" exists. Exemplary model linkages often reflect local conditions and wholesale adoption of models may run contrary to individual partners' needs, expectations, and capabilities. However, there were aspects of a few models which, when combined, seem to be useful to recommend to policy makers both in CETA and community colleges.

CHAPTER ONE

MODEL ONE: BUILDING AND STRENGTHENING LINKAGES BETWEEN CETA AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Successful programs of training and employment are linked to and may stem from a strong system of organizational and operational relationships existing among CETA prime sponsors, community colleges, and the private sector. These relationships must be established, and continuously nourished to maintain a successful linkage and ensure outstanding training and employment programs.

Central to this model are recommendations to build and strengthen linkages. In this report, recommendations take the form of operational needs. Malcolm Knowles, a distinguished adult educator, uses this concept in referring to the providing of the

institutional resources for meeting the educational needs.[1]

Two types of operational needs will be discussed. The first type consists of shared operational needs, that is, needs essential for partners in a linkage to jointly meet. The second are specific operational needs, that is, needs unique to an organization and more likely achieved within the organization.[2]

Both CETA prime sponsors and community colleges have shared operational needs essential to building and strengthening linkages. Among the most important in Maryland are:

1. Building communication, trust, and commitment
2. Emphasizing and publicizing the benefits which result from a CETA/ community college linkage
3. Understanding and coping with contrasting operating styles
4. Choosing an effective liaison person
5. Determining appropriate CETA programmatic functions for community colleges
6. Clarifying responsibility and authority
7. Strengthening linkages with the private sector

A model partnership between a CETA prime sponsor and a community college requires communication, trust, and commitment between both parties. Policy makers and implementers in both organizations must agree to work toward common goals and pledge their organization's resources toward goal-achievement. Personnel in both organizations must possess positive attitudes towards each other that reflect and promote mutual respect, trust, and honesty in professional relationships. Open, direct, and clear communications as well as professional trust does not simply happen. "Wishing it were so" does not alter fragile or hostile relationships.

1. Malcolm Knowles, The Modern Practice of Adult Education (New York: Association Press, 1970), p. 123.

2. These concepts are ideal constructs and in the empirical world there inevitably is some overlap between both types of needs.

In model linkages both parties spend time and energy in promoting and maintaining trust. Unlike the common tendency in many linkages wherein meetings tend to be called to resolve conflict, frequent meetings between representatives in exemplary linkages occur as a matter of normal professional relationships. It is in these customary, frequent meetings, without conflict agendas, that trust and mutual respect emerge. Often such meetings serve to convince each party of the others' honest intentions to achieve mutual goals.

Professional meetings may also serve to inform each party of the different decision-making styles used by each organization as well as providing an opportunity to develop a decision-making process which benefits both the CETA prime sponsor and the community college. A jointly developed conflict-resolution process should emerge from these series of meetings before conflict erupts and prior to the development of organizational "battle plans." Above all, there must be a commitment to a shared responsibility for the training and employment success of CETA participants.

Each organization should become aware of the other and through policy, procedures, and behavior attempt to accomodate the other. All too often "problems" become so because neither party will accomodate the other. Exemplary linkage partners spend time accomodating the others' needs. For example, a community college might employ a manual accounting system to serve the needs of the CETA fiscal year and a local prime sponsor may ask for a Department of Labor policy waiver for the local community college.

Developing communication, trust and commitment between a CETA prime sponsor and community college is a difficult undertaking. California has been a leader in these efforts by involving CETA prime sponsors, community colleges, and the private sector. Under the auspices of the Chancellor's Office of California Community Colleges, a series of state-wide seminars were held to increase communication among these groups and address issues of concern.

Along the lines of California, Maryland can play a greater role in policy leadership and strengthening local linkages. The Maryland State Board for Community Colleges along with the Maryland State Employment and Training Office should plan and implement a series of state-wide and regional workshops for appropriate CETA personnel, community college administrators, and private sector representatives. These workshops ought to:

A. Introduce CETA prime sponsor personnel and private sector representatives to the educational and training capabilities of the Maryland community college system.

B. Introduce college administrators and private sector representatives to CETA.

C. Develop communication linkages among CETA prime sponsors, community colleges, and the private sector.

D. Address problems and prospects of mutual concern and provide an on-going vehicle to share information.

Workshop sessions strengthen communication when each party describes their understanding of the responsibilities and roles of their counterpart while the counterparts listen for correct information. When the process is reversed, language differences, misinterpretations, and misunderstandings are corrected. A major benefit of these workshops is to familiarize state and local people with each other and each others' organizations and priorities. Participants can also emerge with a network of organizational contacts.

A further technique to promote trust is to institute cross-staffing. Cross-staffing can be conceived of as a temporary exchange of staff among CETA prime sponsors, community colleges, and the private sector. Support for this technique was voiced in conversations with community college personnel and CETA prime sponsor representatives.

Under state support and guidance these workshops would bring together local groups responsbile for training and employment. These workshops should be repeated for appropriate policy implementers in local organizations. Building and strengthening communication, trust, and commitment, should be the manifest and latent purposes of these gatherings.

Another shared operational need is to emphasize and publicize the benefits which result from a CETA/community college linkage. Both organizations are more likely to join in and strengthen a linkage when each organization's needs are recognized and met. For CETA prime sponsors the community college is an important community resource. In many jurisdictions for example, Western Maryland, the community college is the major, and perhaps only, postsecondary educational institution able and willing to offer CETA training and employment programs. For community colleges seeking new students, CETA training and employment needs represent a new challenge and source of revenue. As a recent Illinois study of linkages stated, "when resources are scarce or declining such mutually beneficial relationships are more prevalent and interactions are characterized by a high degree of cooperation and problem-solving to achieve mutual gains for both parties."[3] In short, both CETA and community colleges are likely to be attracted to an exchange when both parties recognize the benefits of a relationship.

By and large Maryland CETA prime sponsors recognize the benefits of a linkages with a community college, but not the total range of services and programs available. The community college, however, often is unaware of benefits derived from the potential linkage. Therefore, a significant challenge facing Maryland community colleges is to promote the benefits of involvement with CETA to its faculty and staff. The following major benefits of a linkage with CETA might be emphasized to member of the college community:

A. Serving a significant portion of the community traditionally underrepresented in higher education.

B. Obtaining seed money for high cost new occupational/technical programs.

C. Obtaining new equipment and resources.

D. Bridging the gap between education and work.

E. Building a community college constituency among CETA students.

F. Strengthening ties to the private sector, and receiving equipment, technical assistance, and jobs for students.

3. Illinois Board of Higher Education, Final Report: CETA/Postsecondary Education Linkage Project (Springfield: Illinois Board of Higher Education, 1980), p. 21.

Major benefits of a linkage to non-CETA students should also be recognized and promoted to members of the college community. These major benefits are:

A. Curricula development, refinement, and expansion

B. Use of equipment and resources by non-CETA students

C. Deployment of faculty in new growth areas

D. Successful CETA assessment, training, and placement models are being applied to issues of retention and job placement. For example, the success of the Santa Ana College (California) Language and Assessment Center is to be applied to non-CETA students.

E. Students doing poorly in the traditional credit program, if CETA eligible, can easily transfer into the CETA occupational skills training program of the college.

F. Indicating to local officials and the community, organizational cooperation and shared use of scarce resources.

Perhaps the most beneficial aspect of all is that a linkage prompts both the community college and CETA prime sponsor to examine seriously their own training and educational performance and to make appropriate changes.

Merely to recognize benefits, however, is not enough. There is a need to publicize actively this linkage to the local community. The success of the linkage should be broadcasted through brochures, speeches, campus visitations and other media efforts.

For example, positive publicity is central to Grand Rapids, Michigan Junior College Occupational Training. Displayed throughout this CETA occupational training center are numerous photos, news clippings and flyers which communicate to students and the community the success of the program. Media visits are encouraged and common and serve to promote the fine reputation of the center. This coverage also contributes to the positive self-esteem of students enrolled in Occupational Training. The publicity found at Grand Rapids Junior College Occupational Training can be emulated by other successful training and employment programs. In some cases, both CETA prime sponsors and community colleges have been meek in response to negative publicity. It is time to publicize the success of programs in Maryland.

Understanding and coping with contrasting operating styles in CETA prime sponsors and community colleges can enhance the development of a model linkage. A positive relationship becomes extremely difficult to build when contrasting operating styles are not understood or appreciated. However, an awareness of this contrast is a first step toward coping with differences and accommodating each other.

For example, it is helpful to recognize that some CETA prime sponsors have frequent turnover of staff and are hamstrung by federal regulations. If not understood, this operating style may cause conflict with a more stable and flexible community college. Similarly, unspent monies may prompt CETA prime sponsors to ask colleges to be program operators with insufficient planning time. Such a rush into an operational stage may well create anxiety among accountability conscious community college personnel.

Another important organizational contrast is found in the decision-making process. Colleges have a strong tradition of shared governance and decision-making which precludes fast action. All too often, when a CETA prime sponsor needs quick program planning and implementation, community colleges are too slow and their decision-making process too cumbersome to respond quickly. Yet another critical difference occurs in terms of authority and control. In most work organizations the higher one's position the greater the authority to direct and control subordinates. In many community colleges, however, the authority lies with the faculty - and those in management cannot and/or will not control the faculty. As a result, the success of CETA related policies and programs may be compromised.

A critical contrast can result from the choice of a college official to direct a CETA program. A proven classroom instructor or under-loaded faculty member may lack the necessary planning, implementing, administering, evaluating skills, so crucial to direct a CETA program. This can be further complicated if the administrator's interpersonal relations skills are weak and sensitivity to CETA participants and the CETA prime sponsor is poor.

Other contrasts relate to fiscal/planning year cycles. To be specific, CETA is limited to one year funding arrangements. This can come into conflict with community colleges which prefer multiple year funding for successful programs. Many problems are inherent in accomodation of two different budget cycles.

To some extent, conflicts in a CETA/community college linkage are rooted in two contrasting organizational structures, operations, and styles. Community colleges are typically "organic" work organizations, that is, organizations characterized by mutual consultation to arrive at decisions and extensive individual autonomy. Yet CETA prime sponsors (and many private sector organizations) are typically "mechanistic" work organizations, that is organizations characterized by a fixed division of occupational specialization, less participation in decision making and less individual discretion.

In addition to recognizing these differences, there are strategies to cope with differences. Generally, community colleges are represented on some CETA committees. However, the reverse is less true. There is a reciprocal need for CETA staff to participate on relevant advisory committees existing in the community colleges. Joint participation in each organization's decision-making process is important. Joint participation can provide substantive contributions from CETA staff and indicate professional acceptance and equal status.[4] Some additional strategies would be to:

A. Undertake a joint labor market information survey with other crucial groups in the local community.

B. Establish formal periodic joint planning sessions rather than a single project or crisis situation. Schedule meetings early in planning cycles and focus on allocation of resources, future goals and objectives, and common concerns. This will enhance jointly developed programs and highlight potential areas of coordination and cooperation.

C. Exchange relevant staff meeting minutes to keep both community colleges and CETA informed.[5]

4. Ibid., p. 22.

5. Ibid.

Exemplary linkages have invariably chosen an effective liaison person. The person chosen to direct this office has credibility in the eyes of both the community college and the CETA prime sponsor and is sensitive to the needs of both. This person should have demonstrated skills in program needs identification, program planning, program implementation, program administration and program evaluation. Political acumen and interpersonal relations skills are also necessary for success. These success oriented skills ought to take precedence over variables which are less crucial. To compromise on these skills may damage the linkage.

The liaison person must provide total attention to the program and both parties in the linkage. He or she must be delegated the authority to respond quickly without undue delay associated with a chain of command or extensive participation. CETA prime sponsors often are frustrated by the levels of decision making in community colleges and the apparent inability to make a quick decision. The liaison person must be delegated sufficient authority to respond quickly to CETA prime sponsor training and employment program needs. Other functions of the liaison official are to disseminate appropriate information to both organizations, ensure that communications are clear and direct, ensure that services are not duplicated, and generally monitor and improve organizational relations.

Although the community college is responsible for its own CETA training and employment programs and services, it would be wise to include the local CETA prime sponsor in the selection process of the liaison person. Inclusion in the decision-making process builds trust, professional respect, "ownership", and contributes to a stronger linkage system.

A strong linkage is likely to result when community colleges carefully determine beforehand what CETA programmatic functions they are capable of offering consistent with their mission in the community. To do this, colleges need to be sensitive to the political and social make-up of the community they serve and avoid infringement on other successful program operators. Colleges should identify their strengths, that

is, what they do well whether it be assessment, technical skills training, counseling, placement, etc. or some combination. Community colleges then should attempt to obtain a contract for programs that they can effectively perform.

At the outset colleges would be wise to limit their offerings to already successful services. As successful program functions develop, the college can consider responsibility for additional functions. In short, community colleges need to prove themselves first. Successful programs, facilities, and personnel should be documented in requests to enhance continued or additional CETA contracts. Time spent in planning meetings within the college and between the college and the local CETA prime sponsor on programmatic functions help the college offer what it can best contribute to program success and linkage strength.

Linkages are bolstered when responsibility and authority are clarified. In early planning discussions it is advisable to discuss which organization is responsible for what functions and who has the authority necessary to implement programs. Generally speaking authority and responsibility for programs should rest with the program operators.

A detailed program design and contract should be jointly developed. The contract should clarify responsibilities, activities, time lines, performance standards and authority. The contract is a binding statement of work and should contain provisions for alteration and conflict resolution. In addition to the binding contract it may be beneficial to develop a "philosophical contract" which describes mutually developed objectives, goals, and decision-making processes.[6] Frequent communications conducted during the contract year should identify suggested changes to both contracts. If both parties agree, then contracts should be modified as needed. Successful programs allow for formative changes as well as summative evaluation.

6. The Minnesota CETA-Education Task Force, Planning Together: A Guide for CETA and Education Planners. (St. Paul: The Minnesota CETA-Education Task Force, 1979), p. 9.

The final shared operational need is increasing relationships with the private sector. CETA prime sponsors and community colleges must increase their involvement with the private sector. Greater involvement and participation of the private sector results in numerous benefits to both organizations:

A. Participation in decision-making by the private sector makes them more favorable toward the community college and CETA

B. Potential job placements for students.

C. Donations of funds and/or equipment.

D. Establishment of the community college as a primary training operator for private sector needs.

E. Reduction of the gap between education and work.

A greater partnership with and reliance on the private sector appears to be consistent with the new political climate. It is safe to say that economic development and revitalization will be a major thrust in the nation. Rebuilding efforts also include the up-grading and re-training of those already employed as well as the economically disadvantaged. Employers are likely to have more and more influence and Title VII money for training programs.

Maryland community colleges can do more to strengthen ties with the private sector. Although many community colleges have program/curricula advisory committees, these committees are often rubber stamps for decisions and are generally weak. Such advisory committees need to be strengthened. Private sector representatives should play a more important role in identifying program curricula needs and in developing curricula entry and performance standards along with representatives of CETA and community college instructional faculty. Community college Deans and others responsible for CETA should become members of the local private industry council (PIC). Additionally, community colleges should pursue externships and on-the-job training agreements with local business and industry.

A number of exemplary linkages (for example, the City of Glendale, California CETA Prime Sponsor and Glendale Community College; City of Sunnyvale, California CETA Prime Sponsor and Foothill-DeAnza Community College District; and Grand Rapids, Michigan Area Employment and Training Council and Grand Rapids Junior College Occupational Training) have encouraged local employers to participate in their decision-making process. This has resulted in developing and implementing successful training and employment programs which meet the needs of the private sector. Although the community college is responsible for occupational training it is wise to include participation by the private sector. First, it extends ownership of the program to participants in the advisory process, and second, it brings the community colleges closer to the needs of other central interest groups rather than simply the needs community college's believe students have.

In addition to shared operational needs, there are a second set of specific operational needs. Community colleges must address these needs if they desire a successful CETA linkage. Among the most important in Maryland are:

1. Rededication to and the fulfillment of the philosophy and mission of the community college
2. Commitment at all levels to CETA and occupational training
3. The structure and delivery of CETA occupational training programs
4. Implementing occupational training programs
5. Developing manpower related courses for CETA practitioners

In many states an important part of the community colleges' mission is to provide career education and occupational training. The community colleges visited in this research have been extremely successful in this regard. Others, however, have limited their occupational training programs. Maryland community colleges must re-affirm their commitment to fulfill their mandate to serve the occupational training needs of the community. This reaffirmation could take the form of issuing an institutional statement of philosophy which indicates the college's commitment to serve all the needs of the community and specifically those of CETA participants.[7]

7. Illinois Board of Higher Education, p. 22.

A problem in Maryland (and likely in other states as well) is the lack of academic credit curricula and certificate programs in the blue-collar skilled trades. Most Maryland community colleges have concentrated occupational training in white-collar technical areas, such as nursing, electronics and drafting, but have not developed academic credit programs in such skill trade areas as food services operation, auto body repair, automotive mechanics, diesel mechanics, air conditioning, heating, refrigeration mechanics, sheet metal, welding, carpentry, production machine operators, landscape and nursery management, roofing, and other similar trades. These curricula are abundant in other states, especially in California community colleges. By and Large, Maryland community colleges need to consider the needs for academic credit curricula in the blue-collar skill areas. This ommission may serve to weaken linkages with CETA prime sponsors as they cannot fully use the colleges as training program operators. Linkages are found to be strengthened when responsive curricula are already in place for use by CETA and the private sector.

Some members of the college community might be apprehensive about granting academic credit to blue-collar trade curriculas. Yet, in discussions with community college staff and CETA personnel a prevalent view was that occupational training benefits general education and the college as a whole. Respondents believe that training and employment programs in blue-collar skill areas do not come at the expense of general education but enhance general education.

For a CETA/community college linkage to excel there must be a commitment at all levels, especially the college leadership structure. The active encouragement of the college's leadership to occupational training and servicing the needs of the economically disadvantaged on the state level and on the local level is required. In exemplary linkages decision-makers are supportive of the linkage and have required that this policy be carried out by middle and lower levels of the college. Policy implementation may be substantially aided by convening a series of workshops to familiarize community college faculty and staff with their CETA prime sponsor

counterparts. Policy is ultimately supported by Deans and Chairmen who award or deny extrinsic rewards (pay, promotion, etc.) to faculty based upon adherence to policy and successful performance of CETA related responsibilities.

In summary, decision-makers at the top are successful to the extent they: (1) understand and are responsive to CETA's needs and requirements; (2) promote occupational training linked with CETA; (3) actively encourage and otherwise support those in the college responsible for CETA programs; (4) use system rewards and penalties according to successful performance of responsibilities.

Overall, a new structure and delivery of CETA occupational training and employment programs must be instituted. The focus might be on concerns as diverse as calendar, instruction, facilities, faculty, and staff. The following elaborates on these concerns.

It might be advantageous for community colleges to alter the traditional semester system calendar. The world of CETA and the world of work do not function according to academic semesters. Colleges ought to re-examine their occupational curricula and consider transforming them into an open/entry open/exit format which provides intensive occupational skills training conducted in shorter time frames. Open/entry and open/exit allows students to enter occupational training programs at a number of start-up dates and exit whenever they have successfully met performance standards. This format is learner centered and allows more flexibility, since people enter and progress at their own pace and exit when they are ready.

Instruction might well be individualized and lessons modularized to provide for open/entry and open/exit. Occupational training program instruction ideally should be performance based and a performance progress chart should be developed for each student. Content must reflect what is required in the local job market. Students should be allowed to leave training programs whenever they are job ready. Occupational training programs should be front-loaded,[8] that is,

[8]This term reflects the view of personnel in the San Diego, California Community College Coordinating Agency who are responsible for most Title II occupational training in the greater San Diego area.

instruction in the most essential skills courses should be completed first to permit rapid job placement.

Community colleges which lack campus facilities to conduct a CETA occupational training and employment program, might consider the use of off-campus facilities. In terms of rapid and successful implementation it is advisable to establish a center for program operations physically off-campus, as has been done in Baltimore County. This would allow for a faculty, staff and program tailored to the needs of a CETA population unencumbered by the problems likely to initially emerge as a result of on-campus location. For many CETA students, an off-campus location may be less threatening. Students are more likely to view the facility as their own and more closely identify with it.

For jurisdictions unable to establish their own center, construction of a facility to serve two or more areas may be wise. Purchase of slots in a nearby center is another option which may serve individual jurisdictions. These options may be appropriate in rural areas such as Western Maryland, Southern Maryland, and the Eastern Shore. Ultimately, the location of a center ought to be determined by the extent to which it serves student needs.

Regardless of location CETA and non-CETA students should be mixed in classes to the fullest degree possible. This is particularly true in basic skills and technical skills training. Students can and should learn from one another.

It is appropriate to use the campus, when the necessary physical facilities to conduct a CETA occupational training and employment program are available. It would be a waste of money to duplicate facilities.

Additionally, CETA students are likely to benefit from exposure to a college milieu and socializing with non-CETA students. Also CETA students should be afforded all the benefits of any other college student - use of the library, health services, and student activities. Fees associated with these services should be paid by CETA prime sponsors to ensure that CETA participants are viewed and treated as any other student.

The instructional program must be credible and classroom instructors chosen on the basis of their achievement, talent, enthusiasm, motivation, and dedication. Other program personnel such as counselors and placement officials should be chosen with the same criteria in mind.

Prior to program start-up college CETA personnel can meet with other campus units such as the bookstore, registrar, and business office to acquaint them with the program in order to encourage a smooth and cooperative response. For community colleges involved in less than class size instruction, the CETA prime sponsor should be informed of class offerings and slots well before classes become closed. CETA students should have as fair a chance of gaining entrance into classes as non-CETA students.

CETA programs must be academically sound, so as to draw support from all sectors of the public and the community college. If standards are compromised - or if significant individuals believe they are - the credibility of the training is severely undermined. Reasonable chances for student success can be achieved through basic skills improvement, and counseling and supportive services. However, standards of acceptance and performance should not be lowered. Faculty have the right to expect the same level of performance from a CETA student as a non-CETA student.

Where there is a demonstrated need and where no other postsecondary institution can provide a program, community colleges can offer credit and non-credit manpower related offerings for CETA practitioners. This may take the form of offerings in areas such as human resource development, social/behavioral sciences, economics, business and management, to curricula and certificates in manpower related programs. Continuing education may also be extended to CETA practitioners on off-campus sites on weekends and evenings. The intent of these offerings is to strengthen the skills and expertise of employment and training personnel so they may strengthen services to those they come in contact with.

Finally, community colleges should issue a certificate of completion to all CETA students successful in their occupational training program. These certificates should be issued as part of an appropriate public ceremony to recognize student success in a college program. Not only would this be fitting for students, but it would bring positive publicity to CETA and the college. It would also enhance the image of students in the eyes of prospective employers.

Discussions with some community college officials resulted in some suggested changes to CETA policies. These changes take the form of specific operational needs regarding funding. Community college officials, and some CETA representatives as well, maintain that once the college has established their program credibility and effectiveness, they should be able to get funding approved beyond one year. A formula can be developed to fund the college at the same level stipulated in the contract plus an inflation factor. College representatives spend unnecessary resources to submit yearly proposals for funds when it is a virtual certainty that they will be refunded. This yearly process contributes to unnecessary anxiety for CETA funded staff and contributes to lower morale as staff resources are directed to less productive behavior. In addition, CETA prime sponsors should fund student activity fees and related fees so CETA students have full use of college facilities and activities. Stigmas regarding CETA students are reinforced when CETA prime sponsors refuse to pay such fees.

This first model contains major operational needs essential to building and strengthening a linkage. Both CETA prime sponsor representatives and community college administrators might consider the joint development of a performance plan with related completion dates to implement these needs.

A sample plan might include:

Activity	Completion Date
Develop and implement a state-wide workshop for appropriate CETA personnel, community college administrators, and private sector representatives	September, 1981
Develop and implement a series of four regional workshops, similar to the state-wide workshop, to be conducted in metropolitan Baltimore, Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, the Eastern Shore and Southern Maryland, and Western Maryland	November, 1981
Develop and implement local workshops to explain and promote CETA to members of the college community, and familiarize faculty and staff with their CETA prime sponsor counterparts	January, 1982
Develop and implement a plan for joint participation in each organization's decision-making process	March, 1982

CHAPTER TWO

MODEL TWO: CETA PROGRAMMATIC FUNCTIONS IN MARYLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The second model develops a programmatic linkage system. Before expanding on this model it would be appropriate to detail for the reader some basic principles and practices of adult education.

Most students in CETA training and employment programs operated by community colleges will be adults. Although there may be those who are not adults according to one definition, all students are being prepared to seek employment in an occupation. And acquiring an occupation is a significant aspect of adult role performance and constitutes a major factor in self-identity as an adult. Therefore, it seems important to organize and operate all programmatic functions consistent with sound principles and practices of adult education.

Andragogy, as contrasted with pedagogy. is the art and science of helping adults learn. As Knowles states, andragogy is based on at least four crucial assumptions about the characteristics of adult learners that are different from the assumptions about child learners:

1. As a person matures his self-concept moves from one of being a dependent personality toward one of being a self-directed human being. When a person defines himself as an adult, he sees himself as being able to make his own decisions and face their consequences, to manage his own life. For this reason adults need to be treated with respect to make their own decisions, to be seen as unique human beings.

2. As a person matures, he accumulates a reservoir of experience that becomes an increasing resource for learning. Having lived longer, an adult has accumulated a greater volume of experience and has had different kinds of experience. For most kinds of learning, they are themselves a rich resource for learning. Adults have a richer foundation of experience to which to relate new experiences (and new learning tends to take on meaning as we are able to relate them to our past experience).

3. As a person matures his readiness to learn becomes oriented increasingly to the developmental tasks of his social roles. In the early adult years a central life role is getting started in an occupation. If the teachable moment for an adult to acquire learning is to be captured, it is obvious that the sequence of the curriculum must be timed so as to be in step with his developmental tasks.

4. As a person matures his time perspective changes from one of postponed application of knowledge to immediacy of application, and accordingly his orientation toward learning shifts from one of subject - centeredness to one of problem - centeredness. Adults engage in learning largely in response

to pressures they feel from their current life situation. To adults, education is a process of improving their ability to deal with life problems they face now.[8]

Basic learning principles that are especially applicable to adult learners are:

1. Best learning results when there is some means of applying what we learn. If reading assignments are made, or if problem solving is being taught, it is best to bring in some practical application which will give meaning and justification to the learning.

2. We learn more readily when we are ready to learn or have a strong purpose or desire to learn. It is always necessary to study carefully the individual adult's readiness for learning, and to work with him individually in order that he will be able to participate with more satisfaction.

3. Learning is simplified if what we are learning is built on something we already know. Every new lesson would have some reference to the student's past experience.

4. Learning to be effective must proceed in a logical order. Sometimes the logical order is from the more elementary or less difficult to the more advanced or more difficult.

5. Learning is problem-solving, and problems must be challenging to stimulate learning. Too often a teacher is prone to solve all problems for the student by giving him too explicit directions. If the student is to learn at the maximum speed, he should have challenging problems.

6. More effective learning takes place when learning impressions come through more than one of the senses. Seeing and hearing have come to represent the most used senses in our modern scheme of education. Include as many senses in learning as possible.

7. The first learning impressions are usually the most lasting; therefore, it is important not to convey wrong impressions which must be corrected later. All illustrations and introductions should be checked for: (1) appropriateness (2) correctness and (3) logical order.

8. Learning is more likely to take place if adults have a reasonable chance of achieving early success in their endeavors. Assignments or projects should allow the learner to demonstrate measurable progress. Short assignments and smaller projects are best for beginners.

9. Feelings and emotions are strong incentives for learning. A good instructor should talk frequently with each student. It is only through constant contact that an instructor can determine what the student feels and what problems are hindering his progress.

10. The most effective learning results when there is an immediate application of what is taught. Each adult immediately applies the lesson to his own world. All information should be coordinated with the practical work, thereby giving better understanding to the student as he associates it with his immediate tasks.

8. Knowles, pp. 29-48.

11. The more often we use what we have learned, the longer we retain what is learned. The more we recall a fact we have learned, the more likely it will become permanent knowledge. Likewise, the more we practice a skill, the more likely it will be retained as a skill.

12. Learning requires motivation since interest is necessary for effective learning. If we see a purpose or a need for what we are learning, the better will we retain what we are learning.[9]

With these principles in mind, it is appropriate for teaching faculty to match methods to outcomes in terms of kinds of change:

Type of Behavorial Outcome	Most Appropriate Techniques
Knowledge (Generalizations about experience; internalization of information)	Lecture, television, debate, dialogue, interview, symposium, panel, group interview, colloquy, motion picture, slide film, recording, book-based discussion, reading.
Understanding (Application of information and generalizations)	Audience participation, demonstration, motion picture, dramatization, socratic discussion, problem-solving discussion, case discussion, critical incident process, case method, games.
Skills (Incorporation of new ways of performing through practice)	Role playing, games, action mazes, participative cases, T-Group, nonverbal exercises, skill practice exercises, drill, coaching.
Attitudes (Adoption of new feelings through experiencing greater success with them than with old)	Experience-sharing discussion, group centered discussion, role playing, critical incident process, case method, games, participative cases, T-Group, nonverbal exercises.
Values (The adoption and priority arrangement of beliefs)	Television, lecture, debate, dialogue, symposium, colloquy, motion picture, dramatization, guided discussion, experience-sharing discussion, role playing, critical incident process, games, T-Group.

9. The Maryland Association for Publicly Supported Continuing Education, "The Learning Process," (Baltimore: January, 1976.)

Type of Behavorial Outcome	Most Appropriate Techniques
Interest (Satisfying exposure to new activities)	Television, demonstration, motion picture, slide film, dramatization, experience-sharing discussion, exhibits, trips, nonverbal exercises.[10]

CETA training and employment programs offered by Maryland community colleges must deliver what they publicize. The desire to improve one's position in life - to obtain a "good" job is a major motivation for adults and should be recognized by administrators and faculty. Faculty and staff who are skilled in helping adults learn are increasingly needed in community colleges.

An appropriate programmatic linkage between a Maryland CETA prime sponsor and a Maryland community college should include:

1. Assessment
2. Basic skills
3. Counseling and supportive services
4. Technical skills training
5. Job development, placement, and follow-up

These functions will be developed in the following pages. First, however, there is a need to discuss the division of these responsibilities between CETA prime sponsors and community colleges.

As noted earlier, community colleges should identify the services they are qualified and capable of providing. Generally, Maryland community colleges have considerable expertise and resources in the programmatic functions mentioned above. Many of these functions properly reside in postsecondary education and specifically in the community college.

Occupational training includes such components as assessment, learning work appropriate attitudes and behaviors,and resume writing. By contrast, technical skills training implies learning only job specific content skills. This constitutes one component (albeit an important one) of occupational training, but occupational

10. Knowles, p. 294.

training provides a great deal more than technical skills training. In terms of this report, occupational training encompasses technical skills training.

Interviews with CETA prime sponsor personnel and community college officials revealed a consensus on the most important outcomes of occupational training. Overwhelmingly respondents chose job content skills and learning appropriate work related attitudes and behaviors. Many believe that skills get students jobs and proper attitudes and behaviors keep jobs. If these outcomes are important, and the evidence suggests they are, then the teaching and learning of these skills and attitudes falls within the community college's philosophy, mission, and domain. These programmatic functions are enhanced by the credibility and accountability of Maryland's community colleges.

Although many community colleges in California, and other states, are responsible for CETA recruitment, intake, and eligibility determination, it is questionable whether these functions should be initially assigned to Maryland community colleges. At present, these functions may be better handled by the Maryland Department of Human Resources, Employment Services and other in-place organizations, which is largely the case in South Carolina. There is no need for a community college to duplicate existing state efforts. In fact, absorbing these functions may exacerbate problems in a linkage as the college attempts to get faculty acceptance and support not to mention the damage done to relations with other public agencies. Again, Maryland community colleges should concentrate on what they do best before considering other responsibilities. The same logic may apply to Maryland CETA prime sponsors as well. Their expertise resides in recruitment, intake, eligibility determination, program monitoring, and evaluation, more than program operations.

This division of programmatic functions seems sound when considering CETA training and employment programs from the perspective of the participant. At each step of the process, from intake through placement, participants face many bureaucratic procedures. They may be referred from agency to agency and location

to location. This contributes to a maze-like effect and forces participants, some who lack sharp skills in agency games, to confront the philosophy and personnel of a variety of agencies to achieve their ultimate objectives.

This proposed division of programmatic responsibilities houses functions in only two organizations and locations. Simply put, "two-stop shopping" is more sensible and less confusing and frustrating than "multi-stop shopping." In summary, recruitment, intake, and eligibility determination are the appropriate domain of CETA and related public agencies; assessment, basic skills, counseling, supportive services, technical skills training, job development, placement, and follow-up should be conducted by community colleges. This distribution is more holistic as it serves the total needs of participants during two distinct periods of entrance and training and employment.

This simplified process is more efficient and effective in terms of participant's needs but requires extensive coordination and communication between both organizations and careful tracking of participants within each organization to ensure participant success. It is essential to coordinate all personnel and programs so the student is fully served and to ensure that professionals are aware of their peers' behaviors. This division of programmatic functions goes a long way to bridge the gap between education and work as both functions, to an extent greater than before, are housed in the community college.

The range and quality of programmatic services should be no less than those enjoyed by non-CETA students. Maryland community colleges should only be held responsible for job placement of those successful in community college technical skill training, but should be held responsible for the delivery of other programmatic functions to all students.

All aspects of programs and personnel behavior should reinforce participant's acceptance of responsibility for their decisions. Programs and personnel should not

reinforce or reward organizational or personal dependency and helplessness. Rather, they should motivate participants to assume responsibility for making their own life choices.

The remaining portion of this section will develop each of the programmatic functions Maryland community colleges can and should provide. A basic model of each program function will be offered for consideration.

One of the most important programmatic functions community colleges can provide is assessment. Community college faculty and staff responsible for assessment should join with CETA representatives to develop a guiding philosophy of assessment and program objectives. A number of general guidelines will be offered.

Assessment may be used for at least four purposes:

A. As part of the decision-making process for determining who gets admitted to a specific training and employment program or work assignment.

B. As part of an exploration process for the participant and the counselor to get a better understanding of the person's abilities, interests and needs.

C. As part of the process to evaluate program effectiveness.

D. To develop a detailed employability development plan (EDP) for participants.

If assessment will be used for these purposes, then the student has the right and should be involved in full participation in decision making. This is consistent with the idea that students should become responsible for more of their life planning and choices and because training and education success and employability hinges on involvement.

I believe that the ultimate purpose of any assessment system is to: (1) be a means to successfully identify the needs of a student; and (2) allocate the right type and amount of organizational services to students. Assessment which serves these purposes is proper. Assessment is not intended simply to identify deficiencies, but to identify strengths. Proper assessment does not "screen out" but rather accurately lists and evaluates strengths and weaknesses and recommends training and educational

experiences which meet the needs of the student. Effective assessment is not viewed or used as a "pass/fail" system.

An assessment system should provide information on job interests, abilities, aptitudes, employability attitudes and work appropriate behaviors, reading, writing, mathematics, life skills, and physical and mental health. This information is crucial in the construction of an individual's E.D.P.

The basic issue is not what system of assessment should be chosen, but rather the use of assessment information. The proper use of this information by skilled and sensitive assessment personnel, guided by a sound assessment philosophy and objectives, can not be overemphasized. Assessment test results are only one source of information and should not dictate decision making. Test scores may only indicate gross measurements. They may not be able to provide accurately and/or fully the detailed information needed. Test scores are a guide and should be used in addition to and not a substitute for a variety of other information. Sophisticated testing might well be complimented by information from existing written records from the student and outside sources, information provided by the student in interviews and subsequent meetings, behavioral observations, and comments by outside experts. Also assessment testing does not have to be threatening nor dehumanizing.

Successful assessment may be accomplished through a convergent or divergent approach. A convergent approach emphasizes a comprehensive uniform system of assessment covering everything linked to a general prescriptive theory and/or approach. A divergent approach emphasizes an additive approach wherein assessment techniques are a function of an "add as needed" basis, but lacking an overall theory or strategy. The choice of one approach over another is influenced by budgets, staffing requirements and need for training,and philosophy and objectives of assessment .

Maryland community colleges planning to establish an assessment function might benefit by adopting a convergent approach SO LONG AS SUCH AN APPROACH ALLOWS FOR AND DOES NOT CONFLICT WITH APPROPRIATE ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT TECHNIQUES. Assessment personnel must be trained in at least one approach and develop competencies in assessment. However, one should not assume that because a convergent approach is chosen that it means there is one best way to assess! Once personnel are competent in a particular convergent approach, other instruction or organization generated assessment techniques may be added.

For example, a community college might employ a Comprehensive Occupational Assessment and Training Systems (COATS), as the overall convergent approach. However, when appropriate they should be able, as Grand Rapids Junior College Occupational Training has successfully done to add a self generated math test, vocational interest survey, and staff observations of applicant's work related behaviors and inferences from attitudes.

Assessment is inexact and can be risky. The more information one has representing various vantage points can only add to more accurate assessment and decision making. It is important to remember that the FUNCTIONS OF ASSESSMENT SHOULD DICTATE THE FORM - NOT VICE-VERSA!

North Orange County Community College District, Orange County California through their North Orange County Assessment and Recruitment Center and Rancho Santiago Community College District, Orange County, California through their Santa Ana College Language and Assessment Center and Grand Rapids Michigan Junior College Occupational Training have exemplary assessment programs.

The following assessment flow combines features of those systems:

1. A CETA participant enters a reception area and signs in. Appropriate written forms are filled out detailing the participant's job history, interests, education and health.

2. The participant is oriented to the college's operation, processes, attendance and behavior requirements. What will happen to them while at the college center is explained.

3. The participant meets with a vocational counselor who makes an assessment to determine services and tests most suitable. This initial assessment is a function of a discussion with the participant and forms the client has completed.

4. If the participant is job ready, they are referred back to the CETA prime sponsor for job placement.

5. The vocational counselor schedules assessment services.

6. Assessment technicians orient the participant to the process and components of assessment.

7. Assessment in job interests, basic skills, employability attitudes and behaviors, vision, and hearing are administered to all. Some of these may be inappropriate for those not speaking English or those with college backgrounds - depending on local conditions. Assessment is self-paced and individualized with help by technicians. Technicians observe and record participant's behaviors relative to appearance, cooperation, and frustration.

8. The results of assessment are forwarded to the vocational counselor by the assessment technician. The technician may make broad recommendations.

9. A joint interpretive interview between the vocational counselor and participant is held. Assessment results are reviewed in terms of readiness to enter employment, readiness to enter occupational training, and readiness to learn. Every participant undergoing assessment should be scheduled for an interview.

10. The vocational counselor assigns appropriate work samples based on information gathered and discussed. Work samples should assess the most basic skills to the most complex.

11. Assessment technicians administer work samples and observe and record participant's behaviors. Both time and quality are evaluated.

12. The vocational counselor interprets the work samples with participants during an interview. All information gathered in assessment is used to develop an E.D.P. with the participant. The E.D.P. should contain: (1) client training and employment goals and objectives (short term and long term); (2) participant interests; (3) participant skills and abilities; (4) potential barriers to training and employment; (5) comments regarding barriers; (6) alternative choices; (7) counselor's recommendations; (8) participant's responsibilities; and (9) counselor's responsibilities. The E.D.P. is akin to a contract and should be jointly written and signed by the counselor and the participant. It should be up-dated and revised as needed.

13. The vocational counselor should help develop the E.D.P. not the assessment technician. Although the assessment technician identifies competencies and interests, and may make broad recommendations they should be insulated from making specific recommendations. The reasons for this view are:

A. An assessment technician writing recommendations based on his/her own assessment could constitute a conflict of interest, that is, they could easily avoid being wrong in their recommendations.

B. There could be pressure on the technician to assign individuals to available training program slots regardless of whether they serve the participant's needs.

C. There is a tendency for a self-fulfilling prophecy to occur if the person administering the evaluation is the person making the recommendations.

14. Vocational counselors meet as a team to review each individuals proposed E.D.P.[11] Development and refinement of an individual's E.D.P. could benefit through comments and suggestions made by others.

15. Participants selected into programs offered by the community college, for example, basic skills or technical skills training, are notified in writing as soon as possible. Participants should be given a brief "on the job" exposure to their technical skills training and a meeting with the instructor for the purposes of validating their skill training choice.

16. Those not suitable for programs at that point in time in the community college are notified in writing and referred back to the local CETA prime sponsor. These individuals should have a copy of their E.D.P. sent to the CETA prime sponsor. They should be able to request and be granted a review of the decision. Above all individuals should have an E.D.P. which clearly and accurately addresses their needs and indicates services they require provided by other program operators.

17. While in community college occupational training, the vocational counselor should help counsel and monitor student progress.

For years Maryland community colleges have provided outstanding instruction in basic skills. Past experience with CETA students (and others as well) suggests that basic skills development in reading, writing, and mathematics is a necessary component of training and employment programs.

Those involved in the basic skills component should develop a guiding philosophy and program objectives. Sample objectives might include:

1. Providing students instruction in basic skills that will enable them to enter and perform well in occupational training.

2. Providing instruction in English as a second language (ESL) to non-English speaking students.

3. Providing continued basic skills instruction to each student during their occupational training.

[11] Somewhat similar to this is the Assessment Disposition Team used in South Carolina. This team is composed of one representative from the following agencies: Employment Security Commission, Technical Colleges, Community Action Agencies, Vocational Rehabilitation Department, all PSE Program Agents, and others approved by the prime sponsor.

At the outset all students in basic skills instruction should receive an orientation to this component. Faculty should keep in frequent communication with counseling and technical skills training faculty. A basic skills assessment process identifies strengths and weaknesses for each student. This information should be retrieved from the vocational counselor.

A basic skills performance contract is jointly developed and signed. Student performance should be frequently evaluated and the performance contract revised as needed. Once basic skills have been mastered to permit placement in technical skills training, then the student should formally exit the basic skills component. Basic skills, therefore, must be organized on an open entry, open exit format. Instruction should be individualized whenever possible along with group tutorial instruction as needed. Basic skills students should receive instruction in reading, writing, reading comprehension, mathematics, and life skills. These are the things people ought to learn for their own good, for the good of the organization, and for the good of the community.[12]

Whenever possible enrollment in basic skills should be concurrent with technical skills training. Basic skills instruction should be coupled with technical skills training for basic skills alone is boring and can reduce motivation. As CETA researcher Richard R. Kropp points out, "remedial education programs have worked best when classroom instruction is integrated with skill training, work experience, and other program components."[13] In the case of those with severe basic skills deficiencies that preclude meeting minimum entry-level criteria for technical skills training, basic skills may need to be accomplished successfully before enrollment. Each technical

[12]. Knowles, p. 123.

[13]. Richard R. Kropp, "Higher Education and Youth Unemployment," American Council on Education, (Washington, D.C.: June 10, 1980), p.41.

skills training area should establish minimum entry level competencies in basic skills for enrollment.

Local employers may wish to identify additional educational needs, for example, diagnosing and analyzing problems, which they consider important to occupational success. These skills may be added to program instruction. Instruction in basic skills should complement technical skills instruction such that the expectations of training are continually reinforced throughout the basic skills component.

Like all college students CETA students may require counseling and supportive services. Maryland community colleges should offer these services as part of their overall occupational training program. Counseling and related personnel should develop a guiding philosophy of counseling and develop program objectives.

A useful overview and approach to counseling adult students suggests that:

1. It is better to give the adult no information or no counsel than to give wrong information or counsel based chiefly on guesswork.

2. No matter what the temptation to do otherwise, the educator should make certain that the adult makes his own final decisions. It may hurt to see an adult make "wrong decisions" but such freedom is the root strength of democracy. Many lessons of life are learned as a result of bad decisions, and failure is often as potent a teacher as success. Decision-making is part of the educational experience for adults.

3. The voluntary nature of the adult student should be acknowledged and respected. No matter at what level the instruction is needed and sought, and no matter what type of subject, or vocational skill, or fine arts training, every adult educator has to begin work with adult students with a feeling of deep respect. These people are expressing one of the best aspects of active citizenship. They are seeking to improve themselves, to become better workmen or better craftsmen, or more active workers in their communities.

4. Adults should be informed about other agencies or groups offering educational services in the community whenever it is clear that they can do more for adults.

5. Public educators should recognize that not all problems are soluble through organized education. There are some conditions where direct services, or medical care, or psychiatric advice are quite evidently needed. Under these conditions, the educator should not go beyone his depth, but should arrange for a referral to the proper community service.

6. Good counsel and correct advice may at any time turn out to be just the touchstone to bring all the creative forces in the individual into a new and finer pattern of effectiveness. This should be the hope and the inspiration that sparks the relationship between every educator and every adult student.[14]

The counselor is crucial in the training and educational process helping students help themselves to achieve training and employment goals and greater personal development. A counselor should be a pivotal link between the student and instructor and should coordinate efforts and services to students with other program personnel.

At lease two components of counseling ought to be provided to CETA students:

1. Personnel development which should focus on communications, problem-solving and decision making, feelings, and coping with stress. The importance of these areas should be emphasized and illustrated through the world of education, training, and work.

2. Resource awareness which involves familiarizing students with community resources available to them in health care, higher education, personal finances, etc.

Counselors need to focus not on student problems per se, but in helping to eliminate some of the self-defeating patterns that have hindered job and growth potential. Counselors must be involved in frequent contact with students and provide intensive and regular one-to-one and group counseling sessions at the program site. In their own behavior, counselors (and other staff as well) can be role models for students to study and work with.

Supportive services such as health services, child care, transportation, handicapped services, should be available. More often than not Maryland community colleges already provide health services, student activities and child care. These services should be extended to CETA students as well.

The programmatic structure and delivery system of technical skills can be used by CETA prime sponsors to provide training for CETA students. Basic principles of the structure and operation of technical skills instruction have been developed in prior sections on the structure and delivery of training programs and adult education. These principles underlie technical skills instruction as well.

14. Knowles, pp. 186-187.

As noted before, reindustrialization will be a major focus in the future. This does not only mean the rebuilding of our economic infrastructure but also includes efforts to increase productivity in terms of skill renewal, retraining, and upgrading. Employability development is likely to grow in importance for those not only unemployed but also those currently employed. Maryland community colleges can and should provide leadership to meet these national state and local needs.

Three points should be emphasized at this juncture. First, faculty and others involved in the technical skills component need to develop a guiding philosophy and program objectives. Second, occupational offerings should be based on demand in the community rather than high turnover rates and low training costs. Third, the commitment and involvement of CETA personnel, community college faculty and staff, and private sector representatives should enhance the success of this component. The technical skills curriculum should be developed and updated with private sector participation.

Technical skills training should be performance based and descriptions should include performance levels, the time period in which performance will be achieved and provisions for performance evaluations at relevant intervals. Training should be on an open/entry open/exit format. Lessons should be modularized and each should be self-contained and capable of completion in a short period of time.

Leonard Nadler, in A Process of Training, defines training as the process by which:

1. The behavior of an individual is changed
2. The change occurs over a specified period of time
3. The change can be measured[15]

Nadler's steps in the process of job training are:

1. Develop job standards - identify what the student is expected to do and at what level of performance success. These standards should be developed with

15. Leonard Nadler, A Process of Training. (Washington, D.C.: Leadership Resources, Inc., 1968), p. 3.

maximum participation by private sector representatives and technical skills training instructors.

2. Identify needs - the training needs of an individual might be seen as follows:
   Job standards
   (minus) - What the individual knows, does, or thinks
   (equals)= Needs

3. Determine objectives - specific objectives should be developed and expressed in performance/behavioral outcomes, developed by private sector representatives and technical skills instructors. Objectives are the kinds of specific behaviors expected of the student by the end of the program. Objectives should be clear and unambiguous.

4. Develop curriculum - from the objectives the private sector representative and technical skills instructors should identify the appropriate content which is needed to support the objectives. It is necessary to keep the content related to the objectives.

5. Select methods and materials - methods and materials should be directly related to the learning and should support the underlying learning principles identified by the instructor. Again, function determines form. Training should not lock us into any special techniques, methods or devices until we can answer the question: what is the function that needs to be performed at this time? We must decide what we want to do (content) and then we can identify the form (methods and materials) which might be most helpful.

6. Obtain instructional resources - instructional resources to be obtained should arise as a natural outgrowth of the work done on the previous steps in this process. If budget funds are limited, it may be necessary to re-evaluate and adjust the objectives, curriculum, or the methods and materials. Instructional resources may be obtained both "in house" and "out-of house."

7. Conduct training - the facility should be related to the objectives, needs, content, and method of the training. Training time should be adhered to and attendance taken if appropriate. Those requiring help should be assisted and recognition for those who do attend and successfully complete the program should be given.

8. Evaluation and feedback - this should be part of each of the prior steps. Criteria must be developed for evaluation. What to evaluate is largely a function of the job standards and specific objectives. It is necessary to return to these objectives and determine if the training has met the objectives agreed upon. Evaluation of the curriculum, methods and material, instructional resources and the actual conduct of the training should not be ignored. Students should be involved in the evaluation process at all its various steps. Results of the evaluation of training should be fed back to students as well as those who supervise the student.[16]

The technical skills instructor should orient students to the training program. Especially useful for class size orientations are audio-visual presentations which have the instructor review basic information for beginning students.

16. Ibid. pp. 4, 5 et passim

The technical skills training area can operate according to acceptable workworld standards. As in the case of Grand Rapids Junior College Occupational Training, staff should expect and demand that good work habits be observed in technical skills classes. For example, time cards may be used and shops should be clean, neat, and orderly. These requirements are not only proper in their own right, but also reinforce personal and organizational responsibility and discipline. In terms of physical layout the training area should have a fully equipped classroom located as close to the shop as possible. Training occurs in both the classroom and the shop.

Technical skills training instructors must establish and maintain high performance standards. Faculty, chosen on the basis of their achievement, as well as talent, enthusiasm, motivation, and dedication can serve as role models for students. Students who deliberately and willfully fail to meet standards should be warned, suspended, or terminated.

Success-oriented training is ideally done on machinery and equipment that closely approximates that which is currently being used by employers. Classroom training progress reports should be provided monthly so that students know how they are doing. Progress training reports also alert students to what needs to be accomplished in the future.

An especially successful model program used by the Orange County (California) Manpower Commission with local employers and community colleges is an externship. In this program students alternate classroom technical skills instruction with on-the-job experience in firms that are potential employers. Toward the last month of training a student is eligible for a 120 hour experience in the field. The CETA prime sponsor pays the student allowance and workmen's compensation. The employer places the student in an apprenticeship role where they work on agreed to objectives. There are, of course, written assurances that the student worker will not displace existing employees. This externship agreement allows the employer

to observe and evaluate the worker and vice-versa. More often than not, successful students are hired by the host employer after completion of the training program.

An active job placement program ought to be very characteristic of a CETA/community college linkage. Maryland community colleges which offer occupational training programs must be more responsible for placement of its students. It is especially important to develop a guiding philosophy and program objectives for job development, placement, and follow-up.

It might be noted that job development refers to promotional activities to develop job orders for employment opportunities from public and private sector employers for the specific purpose of placing students. Job placement, the successful placement of an individual in a non-subsidized job, includes job development. For programs to be successful, placement must be provided.

The external functions of the job developer should revolve around a high level of involvement with local private sector groups representing the industry to which the training is related. He or she should be visible in the employer community by:

1. Familiarizing employers with occupational training programs as a source of skilled and reliable workers through public addresses, media presentations, and hosting visitors.
2. Developing and distributing newsletters to local employers.
3. Attending appropriate meetings in the employer's community.
4. Monitoring local and national labor market trends to keep occupational training current.

Employer representatives ought to be informed of the availability of students prior to program completion. Representatives should be encouraged to visit the training site. At the end of a training program cycle, field trips can be arranged for students to evaluate employment opportunities.

Placement success often depends on the credibility of the referring person. Technical skills instructors are urged to refer their best students to the job developer as soon as they are job ready. Successful job developers have contact with employer "gatekeepers" who have confidence in their selection and referral.

The job developer must establish a reputation for good and reliable referrals to local employers. The ultimate success of an entire occupational training program may rest on the credibility of the job developer.

There are numerous internal functions for the job developer. At the outset there should be a coordination of efforts with the counselor. The counselor should not be responsible for the bulk of job development. Counselors may concentrate on some preliminaries, such as job applications and resume writing, but they should mainly re-affirm the employment goal while the person is in training and help sustain student motivation.

About 12 weeks prior to program completion the job developer and student might meet and start job seeking classes and sessions. As has been noted, credible placements are the first and most important concern. The job developer should do most of the job seeking instruction, even at the expense of developing jobs in the community, because one bad placement can damage other efforts. The job developer must spend the necessary time with the student.

Job development instruction should concentrate on resume writing, interviewing and practice sessions. Also, such instruction examines appropriate work related attitudes and behaviors, labor market trends, using employment resources, career paths, job problems and how to deal with them, and researching and evaluating companies and offers.

Job developers ideally work closely with counselors and instructors in order to assist students. These efforts complement efforts to make students more responsible for their own job placement. Students seeking their own jobs help to assume responsibility and results in building self-confidence, self-direction, and self-help.

A model job placement program which emphasizes a self-help approach is operated by the Cambridge (Massachusetts) Office of Manpower Affairs and nearby Middlesex and Bunker Hill community colleges. The Job Factory is an intensive 3-4 week program, combining labor market education and personal selling skills development with carefully

planned and closely supervised job search activities, which result in participants obtaining their own jobs. Simply, the full-time job of a participant is to find a job. Whenever appropriate, efforts by the job developer should be integrated with job efforts by the student participant.

The job development process begins with the job developer working closely with the counselor and technical skills instructor. The technical skills instructor is the major figure to determine when a student is job ready. The technical skills instructor is especially important for at least two reasons: (1) he or she is most knowledgeable about the students performance; and (2) he or she can provide referrals to employers in the community.

When ready for job development,students must be oriented to this function. When the person is job ready, an employability conference is held. In attendance should be the instructor, student, job developer and counselor. The E.D.P. is reviewed and work preferences are discussed. Job orders are arranged by the job developer and/or through the student's own effort.

Job search and selection are crucial. The student should be required to go on all scheduled job interviews. Once an offer or offers have been made the student should accept an employment offer. This should be stipulated in the E.D.P. and should be signed off by those responsible.

Once an individual has been placed a 30, 60, and 180 day follow-up is done by phone or in writing by the job developer. The job developer discusses the worker's job performance and progress with the employer to make sure the individual is functioning satisfactorily.

This model developed programmatic functions which may be appropriate for community colleges to provide. Many of these program functions may be currently operating and might fit the training and employment needs of CETA students as well as the organizational needs of the CETA prime sponsor.

The two models developed in this report were intended to assist CETA manpower practitioners and community college administrators in Maryland. Recommendations to build and strengthen linkages are designed to serve to help both partners, especially those in need of greater purpose and direction.

A successful organizational partnership can set the groundwork for more responsive training and employment programs offered by Maryland community colleges. Perhaps the ultimate utility of the proposed programmatic model rests with CETA program planners and community college faculty and staff. Joint efforts by both to implement demonstration models can enhance the success that all parties seek to achieve.

CHAPTER THREE

STRENGTHENING THE FISCAL LINKAGE BETWEEN MARYLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND MARYLAND CETA PRIME SPONSORS

Community college administrators and CETA prime sponsor representatives identified many complex variables, including local and state funding formulas and funding criteria for local CETA prime sponsors, which make it difficult to identify an optimal model fiscal linkage. It may be useful to expand on these variables.

Generally, community colleges derive support from three primary sources: local taxes, state funds, and student tuition. In Maryland the budgeted 1981 sources of revenue are: state government (36%), local government (35%), student tuition (27%) and other sources (2%). As is the case in many states, Maryland community colleges receive a significant portion of funds from the State. S.V. Martorana and James L. Wattenbarger have identified four major types of state-level support for community colleges:

(1) Negotiated budget under full state support - under this method community colleges are fully state supported by negotiating annually or biannually for funding without the use of specific formulas. Massachusetts is a case in point.

(2) Unit-rate formulas - under this method a defined unit, such as average daily attendance, student credit hours, etc. is used to determine the allocation of funds per unit of measure up to a maximum level. E.F.T. formulas used in Maryland and Sourth Carolina are examples of this type.

(3) Minimum foundation funding - under this method the state guarantees a minimum level of support per student, based on both local and state funds. State support is generally computed at a variable rate dependent upon the amount of local tax funding. The state makes up the difference between the amount of local support and the established minimum standard. California and Michigan are examples of this type.

(4) Cost-based program funding - this refers to the allocation of state funds on the basis of analyses of actual program costs. Minnesota and Florida are examples of this method.[17]

It should be noted that these are ideal types and actual categories are not mutually exclusive. For example, although Illinois uses a minimum foundation funding plan it also relies upon a cost-based program funding method; although South Carolina uses a cost-based program funding method it also uses some money from local taxes.

The derivation of a model fiscal linkage is further restricted by the distinct criteria for and sources of funds for each organization. To be specific, postsecondary education is largely assigned to states and community colleges are funded, therefore, according to local and state policies. Unlike Maryland, there is no tuition charged to students in California community colleges, thus costs to CETA prime sponsors are changed and the issue clouded further. Also, funding for CETA prime sponsors comes from one level, the federal government, and variables used to allocate monies (for example, local unemployment rates, number of low-income people, etc.) are not the same as those used to fund Maryland community colleges.

To improve the fiscal linkage between Maryland CETA prime sponsors and Maryland community colleges this section will suggest shared operational needs and identify state fiscal policies and issues that are in need of greater discussion and resolution.

Before specific issues are raised it is worth noting one major point. It is unlikely that CETA prime sponsors can substantially reduce costs for employment and training programs operated in Maryland community colleges. The primary cost

17. S.V. Martorana and James L. Wattenbarger, Principles, Practices, and Alternatives in State Methods of Financing Community Colleges and an Approach to their Evaluation, with Pennsylvania a Case State (University Park, Pa.: The Pensylvania State University, Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1978), pp. 13-15.

category is instructional salaries and these costs constitute the major cost of programs regardless of location. There are, as one respondent noted, no "good deals" in other states since all pay the bulk of their costs to instruction.

A number of shared operational needs may be recommended to Maryland community college administrators and CETA prime sponsor representatives. Among the most important are:

(1) More effective budget building between both organizations

(2) Familiarizing community college administrators and appropriate CETA officials with each other's fiscal regulations

(3) Recognizing grant and scholarship monies awarded to CETA students attending Maryland community colleges

(4) Evaluating the advantages and disadvantages of class-size instruction and less than class size instruction (individual referrals)

Budget building can be strengthened between both organizations. Necessary time ought to be devoted to a joint approach to a budget building process and the budget itself by community college officials and CETA prime sponsor representatives. Through required written forms and oral communications, a college liaison official and CETA prime sponsor representative should keep each other regularly informed about budget requests and expenditures. In turn the liaison official should transmit information to appropriate college faculty and staff. This type of mutual planning and communication may reduce the likelihood of misunderstandings, surprises, and questionnable accusations.

As part of the state and regional workshops recommended in model one, there ought to be workshops devoted to budgeting. Exposure to each organizations' fiscal definitions and communication systems, expectations, and requirements, should strengthen cooperative budgeting.

The most common budget plan is a line item cost-reimbursement budget. Generally respondents believed that in the long term such a budget is fair to both parties and accountability is maintained. Two associated points may be raised at this time.

First, respondents suggested that one possible solution to indirect costs are to agree to identify these as part of a direct line item cost category. Second, community colleges do provide substantial in-kind contributions which ought to be noted in budget building and recognized by CETA prime sponsors.

Both CETA prime sponsors and community college officials can be more efficient when annual budgets stipulate the number of training hours purchased, not the number of students. Students enter and exit occupational training at various times depending on their success. Therefore, more students can be served, and maximum utilization ensured, when the purchase unit is expressed in hours.

During the budget building process, in instances where state and county aid will be claimed, community colleges should provide a preliminary estimate of expected aid. This recommendation is offered for two reasons: (1) aid figures represent a "good faith" effort by community colleges to promote trust and strengthen a linkage; and (2) aid figures can be used to reduce the final costs to the CETA prime sponsor.

Community college administrators and CETA prime sponsor representatives would benefit by exposure to each other's fiscal regulations. A series of statewide workshops might focus on appropriate fiscal regulations as they involve both community colleges and CETA. Workshop participants could benefit through a detailed explanation, analysis, and application of State Board for Community Colleges Policy 4.9 (COMAR 13.51.01.04 H) and its application to CETA funded programs operated with community colleges (Appendix E). A detailed analysis of Maryland State Field Instruction CETA/Special Grant (S6) N. 5-80 (and related policies) and its application to community colleges might prove helpful (Appendix F).

There may be a gap between policy and correct policy interpretation, implementation and adherence. Time ought to be devoted to resolving questions and reducing misunderstandings and misapplications which may occur within and between both organizations. Participants may suggest recommendations to strengthen awareness of relevant policies and policy application.

An additional agenda item may be a discussion of state and local aid. The

present S.B.C.C. policy 4.9 permits state aid to be drawn when:

A. CETA students are enrolled in credit classes on an individual referral basis.

B. Class size instruction to CETA students exceed costs incurred by the community college and payments made by the CETA prime sponsor.

The State requires each community college to submit projections of equivalent full-time students (E.F.T.). This figure represents the basis for funds budgeted for and allocated to the respective institution. Therefore, if E.F.T. figures are increased as a result of CETA students, a question may be raised as to whether the state/local aid portion should be paid by the CETA prime sponsor rather than the state or local unit.

One view suggests that since CETA increases E.F.T. counts which were unanticipated, then added E.F.T. aid generated by CETA students should be paid by the respective CETA prime sponsor. On the other hand, this logic if applied to senior citizens and others, may limit financial access to Maryland community colleges. These views may be raised and discussed in appropriate workshops.

CETA students are eligible for a variety of non-repayable federal grants and state and local scholarships, such as Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (B.E.O.G.) and Maryland state scholarships. It must be re-emphasized that these awards are non-repayable and are available to undergraduate students enrolled for at least 6 academic credits per academic semester in a program of study leading to an A.A. degree or Certificate in a college.

A reading of State Field Instruction CETA/Special Grant (SG) No. 5-80 indicates that when determining CETA eligibility the following is to be excluded:

"One-time unearned income such as one-time or fixed-term scholarship and fellowship grants"

Similarly, S.B.C.C. policy 4.9 excludes the following programs:

"Any state or federal student scholarship, grant, loan, or work study programs provided either directly to students or directly to institutions."

At the present time therefore, state policy prohibits grants and scholarships from being deducted from state aid determination to community colleges. Similarly, federal CETA policy prohibits grants and scholarships being deducted from student tuition/fee charges, or student stipends paid by the CETA prime sponsor.

In summary, CETA students, like all students, can and do receive non-repayable grant and scholarship aid. If this is an issue of contention, then it lies outside the present linkage system. The bulk of student aid money comes from federal sources, and it is at this level that concerns should be addressed.

The cost and success of occupational training programs are dependent on a number of factors. One important factor is the decision to use class size instruction as opposed to individual referrals, or less than class size instruction.

There are a number of major advantages and disadvantages to total CETA funding of class size and less than class size (individual referral) training and employment programs. When a CETA prime sponsor totally funds class size offerings, they can design or customize the class to suit students' needs. Disadvantages may result (assuming college costs do not exceed CETA payments) as state aid can not be drawn.

Initially, it might be the case that class size training programs better meet the needs of CETA students - although at greater expense to CETA. In the long run, however, as Maryland community colleges become more responsive, individual referrals may be more appropriate and cost effective.

Advantages and disadvantages also apply to individual referral or less than class size training programs. Individual referral can draw state aid and may be more cost effective. However, the major disadvantage of this approach is to restrict the CETA prime sponsor to only instruction and services planned or currently operating. This may reduce the flexibility in training and employment programs and subsequently compromise the fulfillment of CETA students' needs.

Where Maryland community colleges have responsive training and employment programs in place, individual referrals may be more cost effective. Such programs also provide for flexibility and are more likely to meet needs. If community colleges lack necessary training and employment programs, then class size programs may be appropriate until colleges can offer an individual referral option.

Contrasts in the mission and funding criteria of Maryland community colleges and CETA prime sponsors preclude efforts to formulate a model. Efforts to build a model fiscal linkage should not be abandoned. Toward such an end recommendations have been offered to strengthen the financial relationships between both organizations, and identify issues of common concern in need of greater study and deliberation.

Bibliography

Illinois Board of Higher Education. Final Report: CETA/Postsecondary Education Linkage Project. Springfield: Illinois Board of Higher Education, 1980.

Knowles, Malcolm. The Modern Practice of Adult Education. New York: Association Press, 1970.

Kropp, Richard R. "Higher Education and Youth Unemployment," American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.: June 10, 1980, p. 48.

Martorana, S.V. and Wattenbarger, James L. Principles, Practices, and Alternatives in State Methods of Financing Community Colleges and an Approach to Their Evaluation, with Pennsylvania a Case State. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1978.

The Maryland Association for Publicly Supported Continuing Education. "The Learning Process," Baltimore: January, 1976.

The Minnesota CETA - Education Task Force. Planning Together: A Guide for CETA and Education Planners. St. Paul: The Minnesota CETA - Education Task Force, 1979.

Nadler, Leonard. A Process of Training. Washington, D.C.: Leadership Resources, Inc., 1968.

EXPERIENCE SURVEY

Using your own experiences, respond to the following programmatic linkages between prime sponsors and community colleges:

1. Existence and function of a contact person (office) between each prime sponsor and the local community college.

2. Existence and function of current program resources and research, for example:

   A. labor market research and occupational projections in the local community served by the community college and prime sponsor

   B. determining local needs via outreach programs to target groups and target groups' approaches to community colleges

3. Existence and function of program needs identification:

   A. via contact with CETA personnel

   B. via contact with actual/or potential CETA clients or groups

   C. via contact with community college faculty and staff

   D. via contact with private sector personnel

   E. via contact with political officials

4. Existence and function of program planning:

   A. via contact with CETA personnel

   B. via contact with actual/or potential CETA clients or groups

   C. via contact with community college faculty and staff

   D. via contact with private sector personnel

   E. via contact with political officials

   F. program planning for training in:

      knowledge

      skills

      motivation

G. program planning for behavioral changes in:

knowledge

understanding

skills

attitudes

interests

values

5. Existence and function of program implementation in:

A. Title II programs:

1. assessment, placement, counseling services for/with prime sponsor
2. orientation workshops and programs for clients
3. remedial reading, writing, math-basic skills
4. academic/technical courses associated with skill training programs
5. career counseling and development
6. personal counseling/coping programs
7. comprehensive employment and training plan for clients
8. job development and job seeking skills
9. placement services
10. occupational training programs combined with on-the-job work experiences utilizing community colleges as worksites
11. apprenticeship/on-the-job training programs
12. develop/operate specific upgrading and retraining programs with public and private employers
13. public service employment
14. child care programs and other supportive services
15. CETA related college level curriculas, programs of study, certificates

16. training and continuing education for CETA agency personnel

17. staff development workshops involving community college faculty/staff and CETA personnel

18. training and continuing education for other CETA service deliverer personnel

19. research and evaluation studies and technical assistance provided by community colleges for prime sponsor

20. other (specify)

B. Title III programs:

1. vocational resources centers

2. programs for single parents

3. programs for migrant and seasonal farmworkers

4. programs for displaced homemakers

5. programs for offenders

6. programs for people of limited English speaking ability

7. programs for handicapped and those to work with them

8. programs for native Americans

9. programs for middle-age and senior workers

10. programs for public assistance recipients

11. bilingual programs

12. programs for veterans

13. welfare demonstration projects

14. programs for women

15. employment and training research

16. other (specify)

C. Title IV programs:

1. Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects

2. Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects

3. Youth Employment and Training Programs

4. Job Corps

5. Youth Employment Demonstration Programs

6. Summer Youth Employment Programs

7. GED preparation

D. Title VI Programs:

1. public service employment

E. Title VII Programs:

1. Private Industry Councils

F. Title VIII Programs

1. Young Adult Conservation Corps

6. Existence and function of <u>program administration</u>:

A. recruitment of community college staff/faculty to administer programs

B. training of community college staff/faculty to administer programs

C. training and continuing education for CETA administrative and program personnel

D. staff development workshops involving community college faculty/staff and CETA personnel

E. training and continuing education for other service deliverer personnel

7. Existence and function of <u>program evaluation</u>:

A. evaluation of program content and methods

B. evaluation of program quality

C. evaluation of program facilities, supplies, equipment

D. evaluation of program placements

E. evaluation of program personnel

F. evaluation by CETA participants

G. evaluation by CETA prime sponsor

H. evaluation by outside experts

I. evaluation by CETA personnel

J. evaluation by community college administrators

K. evaluation by program personnel themselves (self-evaluation)

L. evaluation by peers (other program personnel)

8. Existence and function of <u>program changes</u>:

A. role of evaluation in determining changes

B. implementing changes

C. evaluating changes

Using your own experiences, respond to the following fiscal linkages between prime sponsors and community colleges:

1. Prime sponsors purchase training from community colleges through payment of tuition for courses enrolling CETA clients. Costs are verified via time and attendance reports.

2. Prime sponsors "block purchase" training classes for CETA clients based upon a negotiated block cost or tuition/fee structure.

3. Expenditures for capital outlay associated with training and education on the part of the prime sponsor are factored into tuition/fee calculations, resulting in lower charges.

4. Prime sponsors pay a fixed cost per training hour determined for each program regardless of client success.

5. Prime sponsors pay a combination of fixed costs per training hour, plus funds conditional on successful client completions.

6. State/local funding to community colleges based on student enrollment and federal/state grants to students are factored into training and education calculations resulting in lower charges.

Appendix B

catonsville community college

August 12, 1980

Dear Colleague:

The State of Maryland, Department of Human Resources, Training and Employment Office has awarded Catonsville Community College a research grant (funded, in part, from the 1% Educational Linkages Funds) to identify and catalogue the various programmatic and financial linkages between selected CETA prime sponsors and publicly funded two-year postsecondary institutions. Data from this questionnaire and follow-up interviews will provide the basis for the development of model community college/prime sponsor linkages in Maryland and other states.

In consultation with local and state officials and organizations, and researchers, your college was identified as one with effective linkages with the local prime sponsor agency. I am interested in your responses to questions about these linkages.

I hope you will respond to the small number of questions. Your response to the enclosed questions will determine the results of model linkages to be developed and recommended to both prime sponsors and publicly funded community/junior and technical colleges. Your responses will be strictly confidential; no names or personal information will be released to officials of your college, the Department of Labor, or community colleges. Only summary data will be released. The number in the left-hand corner of the self-addressed and postage paid envelope is so that I will know that you have returned the questionnaire and need not be recontacted. Please return the completed questionnaire as soon as possible but no later then August 30, 1980.

If you would like to amplify or clarify your responses, please do so. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me.

Thank you for your assistance.

Cordially yours,

Joel D. Lapin

Joel D. Lapin
Project Director
CETA/Community College
Interface Research Project
(301) 455-4275

JDL:cs

800 south rolling road · baltimore county, maryland 21228

CETA/Community College Interface Research Project

College Questionnaire

Instructions: Read each question and response choice carefully. Most questions can be answered by placing a check in the blank next to the response you want to select. If you do not find the exact response that fits your case, select the one that is closest in meaning.

Definitions: The terms community college, junior college, technical college, and vocational-technical institute are limited to publicly funded two-year post secondary institutions.

1. Name and address of community/junior and/or technical college_____

_____

_____

2. Name and title of official completing questionnaire_____

_____

_____

3. To what extent is your college knowledgeable about the local CETA prime sponsor agency's training, educational, and organizational needs? (Check one)

_____ A. to a very little extent

_____ B. to a little extent

_____ C. uncertain/don't know

_____ D. to some extent

_____ E. to a great extent

_____ F. to a very great extent

4. Place a check next to the one statement which best characterizes your college's attitude toward providing training, education and related programs for/with the local CETA prime sponsor agency.

_____ training, education and related programs for/with the local CETA prime sponsor should only be provided to obtain additional revenue.

_____ whenever possible, training, education and related programs for/with the local CETA prime sponsor should be provided consistent with the college's mission.

_____ training, education and related programs for/with the local CETA prime sponsor should only be provided in limited program areas.

_____ other (please specify)

5. To what extent is your college's existing relationship with the local CETA prime sponsor agency viewed as unsatisfactory? (Check one)

_____ A. to a very little extent

_____ B. to a little extent

_____ C. uncertain/don't know

_____ D. to some extent

_____ E. to a great extent

_____ F. to a very great extent

6. Using 100% as the sum total, what approximate per cent of total CETA prime sponsor agency monies are allocated to your college among the following CETA Titles:

_____ Title II, Comprehensive Employment and Training Services

_____ Title III, Special Federal Responsibilities

_____ Title IV, Youth Programs

_____ Title VI, Countercyclical Public Service Employment

_____ Title VII, Private Sector Opportunities for the Economically Disadvantaged

_____ Title VIII, Young Adult Conservation Corps

100% - Total

7. List and briefly describe any training, education and related programs currently operated by your college for or with the local CETA prime sponsor agency which your college believes to be outstanding.

Name of Program	Brief Program Description	Name and Address of local prime sponsor agency	Contact Person	CETA Title Number

8. Which of the following factors best explains why the programs listed in question number 7 are outstanding? (Check as many as appropriate)

_____ CETA agency program personnel

_____ college program personnel

_____ private sector personnel

_____ local political officials

_____ program content

_____ program delivery

_____ job placements arising from program

_____ other (please specify)

9. Using your own experiences, to what extent are the following financial linkages between your college and the local prime sponsor agency utilized? (Check one)

A. Prime sponsors purchase training from community colleges for individual enrollments through payment of tuition for courses enrolling CETA clients. Costs are verified via time and attendance reports.

_____ A. to a very little extent

_____ B. to a little extent

_____ C. uncertain/don't know

_____ D. to some extent

_____ E. to a great extent

_____ F. to a very great extent

B. Prime sponsors "block purchase" training classes for CETA clients based upon a negotiated block cost or tuition/fee structure.

_____ A. to a very little extent

_____ B. to a little extent

_____ C. uncertain/don't know

_____ D. to some extent

_____ E. to a great extent

_____ F. to a very great extent

C. Expenditures for capital outlay associated with training and education on the part of the prime sponsor are factored into tuition/fee calculations, resulting in lower charges.

_____ A. to a very little extent

_____ B. to a little extent

_____ C. uncertain/don't know

_____ D. to some extent

_____ E. to a great extent

_____ F. to a very great extent

D. State/local funding to community colleges based on student enrollment and federal/state grants to students are factored into training and education calculations, resulting in lower charges.

_____ A. to a very little extent

_____ B. to a little extent

_____ C. uncertain/don't know

_____ D. to some extent

_____ E. to a great extent

_____ F. to a very great extent

E. Prime sponsors pay a fixed cost per training hour determined for each program regardless of client success.

_____ A. to a very little extent

_____ B. to a little extent

_____ C. uncertain/don't know

_____ D. to some extent

_____ E. to a great extent

_____ F. to a very great extent

F. Prime sponsors pay a combination of fixed costs per training hour, plus funds conditional on successful client completions.

_____ A. to a very little extent

_____ B. to a little extent

_____ C. uncertain/don't know

_____ D. to some extent

_____ E. to a great extent

_____ F. to a very great extent

10. In general, would you characterize your college's programmatic relationships with the local CETA prime sponsor agency as being: (Check one)

_____ A. very unsuccessful

_____ B. unsuccessful

_____ C. somewhat unsuccessful

_____ D. neither unsuccessful nor successful

_____ E. somewhat successful

_____ F. successful

_____ G. very successful

_____ H. don't know

11. In general, would you characterize your college's financial relationship with the local CETA prime sponsor agency as being: (Check one)

_____ A. very unsatisfactory

_____ B. unsatisfactory

_____ C. somewhat unsatisfactory

_____ D. neither satisfactory nor unsatisfactory

_____ E. somewhat satisfactory

_____ F. satisfactory

_____ G. very satisfactory

_____ H. don't know

12. In general, to what extent does the local CETA prime sponsor agency fulfill the organizational needs of your college? (Check one)

_____ A. to a very little extent

_____ B. to a little extent

_____ C. uncertain/don't know

_____ D. to some extent

_____ E. to a great extent

_____ F. to a very great extent

13. In general, to what extent does the local CETA prime sponsor agency fulfill the needs of CETA participants as individuals? (Check one)

_____ A. to a very little extent

_____ B. to a little extent

_____ C. uncertain/don't know

_____ D. to some extent

_____ E. to a great extent

_____ F. to a very great extent

IF YOU HAVE NOT DONE SO ALREADY, PLEASE SEND ANY WRITTEN MATERIALS RELEVANT TO CETA TRAINING, EDUCATION, AND RELATED PROGRAMS PROVIDED BY YOUR COLLEGE FOR OR WITH THE LOCAL CETA PRIME SPONSOR AGENCY.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORT. PLEASE PROVIDE ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION YOU FEEL WOULD BE HELPFUL.

Appendix B

catonsville community college

August 12, 1980

Dear Colleague:

The State of Maryland, Department of Human Resources, Training and Employment Office has awarded Catonsville Community College a research grant (funded, in part, from the 1% Educational Linkages Funds) to identify and catalogue the various programmatic and financial linkages between selected CETA prime sponsors and publicly funded two-year post secondary institutions. Data from this questionnaire and follow-up interviews will provide the basis for the development of model community college/prime sponsor linkages in Maryland and other states.

In consultation with local, state, and federal officials and organizations, and CETA researchers, your prime sponsor agency was identified as one with effective linkages with local publicly funded community/junior colleges. I am interested in your responses to questions about these linkages.

I hope you will respond to the small number of questions. Your response to the enclosed questions will determine the results of model linkages to be developed and recommended to both prime sponsors and publicly funded community/junior colleges. Your responses will be strictly confidential; no names or personal information will be released to officials of your organization, the Department of Labor, or community colleges. Only summary data will be released. The number in the left-hand corner of the self-addressed and postage paid envelope is so that I will know that you have returned the questionnaire and need not be recontacted. Please return the completed questionnaire as soon as possible but no later then August 30.

If you would like to amplify or clarify your responses, please do so. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me.

Thank you for your assistance.

Cordially yours,

Joel D. Lapin

Joel D. Lapin
Project Director
CETA/Community College
Interface Research Project
(301) 455-4275

JDL:cs

800 south rolling road · baltimore county, maryland 21228

CETA/Community College Interface Research Project

Prime Sponsor Questionnaire

Instructions: Read each question and response choice carefully. Most questions can be answered by placing a check in the blank next to the response you want to select. If you do not find the exact response that fits your case, select the one that is closest in meaning.

Definitions: The terms community college, junior college, technical college, and vocational technical institute are limited to publicly funded two-year post secondary institutions.

1. Name and address of prime sponsor agency_____ _____

_____

_____

2. Name and title of official completing questionnaire_____

_____

_____

3. To what extent is your prime sponsor agency staff knowledgeable about the local publicly funded community/junior and/or technical college's resources (faculty, staff, facilities, courses, etc.) which could be used in CETA training, education, and related programs? (Check one)

_____ A. to a very little extent

_____ B. to a little extent

_____ C. uncertain/don't know

_____ D. to some extent

_____ E. to a great extent

_____ F. to a very great extent

4. Place a check next to the one statement which best characterizes your prime sponsor agency's attitude toward using local publicly funded community/junior and/or technical colleges as service deliverers for CETA training, education, and related programs.

_____ colleges should be used as service deliverers only to satisfy CETA legislative requirements

_____ whenever possible colleges should be used as service deliverers primarily because of their experiences, resources, and responsiveness

_____ colleges should be used as service deliverers primarily in limited program areas

_____ other (please specify)

5. To what extent is your prime sponsor agency's existing relationship with the local publicly funded community/junior and/or technical college viewed as unsatisfactory? (Check one)

_____ A. to a very little extent

_____ B. to a little extent

_____ C. uncertain/don't know

_____ D. to some extent

_____ E. to a great extent

_____ F. to a very great extent

6. Using 100% as the sum total, what approximate per cent of monies are allocated to publicly funded community/junior and/or technical colleges among the following CETA Titles:

_____ Title II, Comprehensive Employment and Training Services

_____ Title III, Special Federal Responsibilities

_____ Title IV, Youth Programs

_____ Title VI, Countercyclical Public Service Employment

_____ Title VII, Private Sector Opportunities for the Economically Disadvantaged

_____ Title VIII, Young Adult Conservation Corps

100% - Total

7. List and briefly describe any training, education and related programs currently operated with or by publicly funded community/junior and/or technical colleges which your prime sponsor agency believes to be outstanding.

Name of Program	Brief Program Description	Name and Address of Community College	Contact Person	CETA Title Number

8. Which of the following factors best explains why the programs listed in question number 7 are outstanding? (Check as many as appropriate)

_____ CETA agency program personnel

_____ college program personnel

_____ private sector personnel

_____ local political officials

_____ program content

_____ program delivery

_____ job placements arising from program

_____ other (please specify)

9. Using your own experiences, to what extent are the following financial linkages between your prime sponsor agency and community/junior and/or technical colleges utilized? (Check one)

A. Prime sponsors purchase training from community colleges for individual enrollments through payment of tuition for courses enrolling CETA clients. Costs are verified via time and attendance reports.

_____ A. to a very little extent

_____ B. to a little extent

_____ C. uncertain/don't know

_____ D. to some extent

_____ E. to a great extent

_____ F. to a very great extent

B. Prime sponsors "block purchase" training classes for CETA clients based upon a negotiated block cost or tuition/fee structure.

_____ A. to a very little extent

_____ B. to a little extent

_____ C. uncertain/don't know

_____ D. to some extent

_____ E. to a great extent

_____ F. to a very great extent

C. Expenditures for capital outlay associated with training and education on the part of the prime sponsor are factored into tuition/fee calculations, resulting in lower charges.

_____ A. to a very little extent

_____ B. to a little extent

_____ C. uncertain/don't know

_____ D. to some extent

_____ E. to a great extent

_____ F. to a very great extent

D. State/local funding to community colleges based on student enrollment and federal/state grants to students are factored into training and education calculations, resulting in lower charges.

_____ A. to a very little extent

_____ B. to a little extent

_____ C. uncertain/don't know

_____ D. to some extent

_____ E. to a great extent

_____ F. to a very great extent

E. Prime sponsors pay a fixed cost per training hour determined for each program regardless of client success.

_____ A. to a very little extent

_____ B. to a little extent

_____ C. uncertain/don't know

_____ D. to some extent

_____ E. to a great extent

_____ F. to a very great extent

F. Prime sponsors pay a combination of fixed costs per training hour, plus funds conditional on successful client completions.

_____ A. to a very little extent

_____ B. to a little extent

_____ C. uncertain/don't know

_____ D. to some extent

_____ E. to a great extent

_____ F. to a very great extent

10. In general, would you characterize your prime sponsor agency's programmatic relationships with local publicly funded community/junior and/or technical colleges as being: (Check one)

_____ A. very unsuccessful

_____ B. unsuccessful

_____ C. somewhat unsuccessful

_____ D. neither unsuccessful nor successful

_____ E. somewhat successful

_____ F. successful

_____ G. very successful

_____ H. don't know

11. In general, would you characterize your prime sponsor agency's financial relationship with local publicly funded community/junior and/or technical colleges as being: (Check one)

_____ A. very unsatisfactory

_____ B. unsatisfactory

_____ C. somewhat unsatisfactory

_____ D. neither satisfactory nor unsatisfactory

_____ E. somewhat satisfactory

_____ F. satisfactory

_____ G. very satisfactory

_____ H. don't know

12. In general, to what extent does the local publicly funded community/junior and/or technical college fulfill the organizational needs of your prime sponsor agency? (Check one)

_____ A. to a very little extent

_____ B. to a little extent

_____ C. uncertain/don't know

_____ D. to some extent

_____ E. to a great extent

_____ F. to a very great extent

13. In general, to what extent does the local publicly funded community/junior and/or technical college fulfill the needs of CETA participants as individuals? (Check one)

_____ A. to a very little extent

_____ B. to a little extent

_____ C. uncertain/don't know

_____ D. to some extent

_____ E. to a great extent

_____ F. to a very great extent

IF YOU HAVE NOT DONE SO ALREADY, PLEASE SEND ANY WRITTEN MATERIALS RELEVANT TO CETA TRAINING, EDUCATION, AND RELATED PROGRAMS PROVIDED BY OR WITH LOCAL PUBLICLY FUNDED COMMUNITY/JUNIOR AND/OR TECHNICAL COLLEGES.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORT. PLEASE PROVIDE ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION YOU FEEL WOULD BE HELPFUL.

Appendix C
Questionnaire Responses and Analysis

Sample CETA prime sponsor and community college questionnaires can be found in Appendix B. Within this section, only the predominant responses will be reported. In some cases percentage responses have been rounded off.

Tables 1, 2, and 3 indicate questionnaire distribution and return by type of organization and location:

Table 1
Questionnaire Distribution and Return by CETA Prime Sponsor and Location

	Number Surveyed	Number Returned	Percent Returned
Maryland	7	7	100%
Out-of-State	36	26	72%

Table 2
Questionnaire Distribution and Return by Community College and Location

	Number Surveyed	Number Returned	Percent Returned
Maryland	20	16	80%
Out-of-State	34	24	71%

Table 3
Combined Questionnaire Distribution and Return

	Number Surveyed	Number Returned	Percent Returned
Maryland	54	40	74%
Out-of-State	43	33	77%

Question 3

Maryland CETA prime sponsor staff consider themselves knowledgeable "to a great extent" (57%) and "to some extent" (43%) about the local community college's resources which could be used in CETA training and education programs. Out-of-state CETA prime sponsor staff consider themselves more knowledgeable as evidenced by 42% of the respondents indicating "to a great extent" and 31% "to a very great extent."

Maryland community college officials consider themselves quite knowledgeable "to a great extent" (44%) and "to a very great extent" (31%) about the local CETA prime sponsor's training, educational, and organizational needs. Out-of-state college officials indicated greater knowledge "to a very great extent" (46%) and "to a great extent"(46%) about the local CETA prime sponsor's needs.

Question 4

Maryland CETA prime sponsor staff believe in using local community colleges as service deliverers whenever possible primarily because of the college's experiences, resources, and responsiveness (71%). This was somewhat less the case for out-of-state CETA prime sponsor staff (61%). Only 14% of Maryland CETA prime sponsor staff responded that community colleges should be used as service deliverers primarily in limited program areas whereas 35% of out-of-state CETA prime sponsor staff responded in a similar manner.

Maryland community college officials strongly believe that whenever possible, training and related programs for/with the local CETA prime sponsor should be provided consistent with the college's mission (88%). Out-of-state community college officials responded more emphatically (96%).

Only 12% of Maryland community college officials believe that training, education, and related programs for/with the local CETA prime sponsor should be provided in limited program areas. This was even less the case for out-of-state community college officials (4%).

Question 5

When asked to evaluate the extent to which the relationship between Maryland community colleges and Maryland CETA prime sponsors was unsatisfactory, Maryland CETA prime sponsors minimized the extent of dissatisfaction. Dissatisfaction "to a very little extent" (71%), "to some extent" (14%) and "to a great extent" (14%) was expressed. Similar responses were indicated by out-of-state CETA prime sponsors. Dissatisfaction "to a very little extent" (46%) and "to a little extent" (34%) were noted.

Maryland community college officials were more dissatisfied. Thirty-one percent are dissatisfied "to some extent," "to a very little extent" (50%), and "to a little extent" (19%). Out-of-state college officials responded "to a very little extent" (63%) and "to a little extent" (25%).

Question 6

Although this question appeared to be clear it was ambiguous. The intent of the question was to get an answer to the following: Of the total amount of local CETA dollars available, what percentage of funds are awarded to the community college by title? Some respondents may have interpreted the question as: Of the total CETA dollars awarded to the community college, what percentage is applied to each title? Some respondents appeared to have answered the latter question, whereas others the former.

The likelihood that several interpretations of the question occurred to respondents is evidenced by: (1) percentage responses less than or greater than 100;(2) respondents unable to accurately provide approximate percentages as some community colleges receive funds from two or more CETA prime sponsors;(3) respondents indicating their lack of information being requested, and (4) large numbers not answering the question.

As a result analysis of responses has been omitted.

Question 7

A large number and variety of training and employment programs were noted by all respondent groups. They range from training programs in clerical skills, health

care, licensed practical nursing, electronics, data processing, and banking to carpentry, building maintenance, auto technology, major appliance repair, machining, welding, and heating and refrigeration repair. Some of the more unique programs noted were aviation power plant mechanic, landscape development and maintenance, solar technology, housing repair and maintenance, and business machine repair.

Question 8

From a list of factors respondents checked as many they believed contributed to their program success. Since more than one response was checked, analysis will only concentrate on the most frequently checked responses. The four factors mentioned most frequently by Maryland CETA prime sponsors were: job placements (57%); CETA prime sponsor program personnel (43%); college program personnel (43%), and program delivery (43%). Out-of-state CETA prime sponsors noted: college program personnel (77%); CETA prime sponsor program personnel (65%); program content (65%), and program delivery (65%).

Maryland community college officials chose program content (75%); college program personnel (69%); program delivery (62%), and CETA prime sponsor program personnel (50%). Out-of-state community college officials chose college program personnel (83%); program content (75%); program delivery (71%), and job placements (58%).

Question 9 A

Maryland CETA prime sponsors reported that they purchase training from community colleges for individual enrollments through payment of tuition "to a great extent" (43%), and "to some extent" (43%). Fourteen percent follow this practice "to a very great extent."

Out-of-state CETA prime sponsors reported this practice "to some extent" (27%), and "to a very little extent" (23%). Nineteen percent noted "to a great extent," and "to a little extent" was the case for 15%. The practice of individual tuition payments was noted by 92% of the respondents, whereas only 8% reported "not at all."

Maryland community college officials reported the practice "to some extent" (44%), "to a great extent" (19%), and "to a very great extent" (19%). Interestingly, out-of-state community college officials responded "to a very little extent" (21%), "to a very great extent" (21%), and "not at all" (21%). Seventeen percent chose "to some extent" followed by "to a great extent" (12%).

Question 9 B

Maryland CETA prime sponsors reported "block purchasing" (class size) training classes "to a great extent" (43%) and "to some extent" (29%). Yet, "to a very little extent" and "to a little extent" was chosen by 14% respectively. Out-of-state CETA prime sponsors reported this practice "to a very great extent" (23%), and "to some extent" (23%). Yet, "to a very little extent" and "to a great extent" was chosen by 19% respectively.

Maryland community college officials chose "to some extent" (44%) followed by "to a great extent" and "to a very great extent" by 25% respectively. Out-of-state community college officials noted "to some extent" and "to a great extent" by 21% respectively. Twenty-one percent chose "to a very little extent" and "to a very great extent" was noted by 17%.

Question 9 C

Maryland CETA prime sponsors were asked whether expenditures for capital outlay were factored into tuition/fee calculations. Twenty-nine percent responded "don't know" and "to some extent." "To a very little extent," "to a little extent," and "not at all" were chosen by 14% respectively. Out-of-state CETA prime sponsors responded "don't know" (27%), "to some extent" (23%), and "to a very little extent" (19%).

Maryland community college officials factor expenditures for capital outlay into tuition/fee calculations "to a very little extent" (44%) and "to some extent" (13%). Others responded "don't know" and "not at all" by 13% respectively. Out-of-state community colleges responded "to a very little extent" (33%), "don't know" (21%), and "to some extent" and "not at all" by 13% respectively.

Question 9 D

Maryland CETA prime sponsors responded "don't know" (43%) to whether or not state and local funding to community colleges based on student enrollment and federal/state grants to students are factored into costs. "To a very little extent," "to a little extent," "to some extent," and "to a great extent" were chosen by 14% respectively. Out-of-state CETA prime sponsors'responses were "to a very little extent" (27%), followed by "don't know" and "to some extent" by 19% respectively.

Maryland community college officials responded "to a very little extent" (50%), "to a great extent" (25%), and "to some extent" (19%). Out-of-state community college responses were "to a very great extent" (33%), "to a very little extent" (21%), and "to a little extent" (17%).

Question 9 E

Maryland CETA prime sponsors reported that "to a great extent" (29%) they pay a fixed cost per training hour determined for each program regardless of client success. With the exception of "don't know" all other response choices were selected by 14% respectively. Out-of-state CETA prime sponsor responses were noticeably different. "To a very great extent" was chosen by (35%) followed by "to a very little extent" (27%) and "to a great extent" (23%).

Maryland community college officials responded "to a great extent" (31%) followed by "to a very little extent" (19%) and "to a very great extent" (13%). Out-of-state community college officials responded "to a very little extent," "to a little extent," and "to some extent" by 21% respectively. Sixteen percent chose "to a great extent" and 13% chose "don't know."

Question 9 F

Maryland CETA prime sponsors reported that "to a very little extent" (71%) they pay a combination of fixed costs per training hour, plus funds conditional on successful client completions. The remaining 29% chose "not at all." Similarly, out-of-state CETA prime sponsor responses were "to a very little extent" (73%), "to a little extent" (12%) and "not at all" (12%).

Maryland community college officials responded similarly to their state CETA colleagues. Eighty-one percent chose "to a very little extent" followed by "to a little extent," "to a great extent," and "not at all" by 6% respectively. Out-of-state community college officials chose "to a very little extent" (46%), "to some extent" (21%), and "not at all" (17%).

Question 10

Maryland CETA prime sponsors were asked to evaluate their programmatic relationships with local community colleges. Fifty-seven percent responded "somewhat successful" followed by "very successful" (29%) and "successful" (14%). Out-of-state CETA prime sponsors responded "successful" (50%) followed by "very successful" (31%) and "somewhat successful" (11%).

Maryland community college officials were asked to evaluate their programmatic relationships with the local CETA prime sponsor. Fifty percent responded "very successful" followed by "somewhat successful" (25%) and "successful" (13%). Out-of-state community colleges responded "very successful" (50%) followed by "successful" (38%) and "somewhat successful" (8%).

Question 11

Maryland CETA prime sponsors were asked to evaluate their financial relationship with the local community college. Respondents chose "satisfactory" (57%) followed by "somewhat satisfactory," "neither satisfactory nor unsatisfactory," and "don't know" by 14% respectively. Out-of-state CETA prime sponsors responded "satisfactory" (54%) followed by "somewhat satisfactory" and "very satisfactory" by 19% respectively.

Maryland community college officials were asked to evaluate their financial relationship with the local CETA prime sponsor. Forty-four percent chose "satisfactory" followed by "very satisfactory" (38%) and "somewhat satisfactory" (12%). Out-of-state community college officials responded "very satisfactory" (42%) followed by "satisfactory" (38%), "somewhat satisfactory" and "somewhat unsatisfactory" by 8% respectively.

Question 12

Maryland CETA prime sponsors were asked to evaluate the extent to which the local community college fulfills the organizational needs of the agency. Respondents chose "to some extent" (57%) followed by "to a great extent" (29%), and "to a very little extent" (14%). Out-of-state CETA prime sponsors chose "to some extent" (46%) followed by "to a great extent" (35%) and "to a very great extent" (11%).

Maryland community college officials were asked to evaluate the extent to which the local CETA prime sponsor fulfills the organizational needs of the college. Respondents noted "to some extent" (44%) followed by "to a very little extent" (25%), and "to a great extent" and "don't know" by 13% respectively. Out-of-state community college respondents chose "to a great extent" (29%) followed by "to some extent" (25%), and"to a very great extent," "to a little extent," and "to a very little extent" by 13% respectively.

Question 13

Maryland CETA prime sponsors were asked to evaluate the extent to which the local community college fulfills the needs of CETA participants as individuals. Respondents chose "to some extent" (71%) followed by "to a great extent" and "to a very little extent" by 14% respectively. Out-of-state CETA prime sponsors chose "to a great extent" (58%) followed by "to some extent" (27%) and "to a very great extent" (11%).

Maryland community college officials were asked to evaluate the extent to which the local CETA prime sponsor fulfills the needs of CETA participants as individuals. Respondents indicated "to some extent" (44%) followed by "to a great extent" (25%) and "don't know" (13%). Out-of-state community college officials responded "to a great extent" (33%) followed by "to some extent" (29%), and "don't know" (25%).

Appendix D

Interview Schedule/Community College Personnel

1. With regard to question number 8 on the questionnaire, would you rank order and elaborate upon the reasons checked for the success of your programs?

2. Using your own relationship with the local CETA prime sponsor agency as an example, what are the factors you believe are necessary for a successful linkage between the community college and CETA?

3. How do you determine who is best to handle what program function?

4. How do you clarify and coordinate responsibility and authority?

5. What changes in the following areas of a community college are needed to meet CETA's needs?

   A. Community college personnel - for example, presidents, deans, faculty, staff, etc.

   B. Structure of the college - for example, registration, credit, "mainstreaming" of CETA students, content of course offerings, programs, curricula, etc.

   C. Delivery of content - for example, program length, accessibility, entrance, exit, etc. and especially the role of the faculty and staff.

6. What changes in the following areas of CETA are needed to meet the community college's needs?

   A. Structure of CETA - for example, organizational positions and personnel, communication patterns, style of operation, policies, contracts, etc.

   B. Content of CETA desired training and education programs.

7. What are the short-term and long-term implications of your programmatic linkage system for:

   A. CETA clients

   B. Community College

   C. CETA Prime Sponsor Agency

   D. Non-CETA students at the college

8. What changes would you make in your own model?

9. Through your relationship with CETA, how have you brought the world of work and education more closely together?

10. Do you have any data which indicates that training and educational programs offered by your community college are more successful and cost effective than if conducted by a local CBO?

11. What are the short-term and long-term implications of your current funding agreement with CETA?

12. How do you equate E.F.T., A.D.A., etc. in open labs and classrooms where students enter and exit at different times and exit before the full completion period of hours? How are you reimbursed if a person takes twice as long for the completion period?

13. Does your community college provide labor market research for the local prime sponsor? If yes, what advantages result?

14. Does your community college provide continuing education for CETA agency personnel or other service deliver personnel? If yes, what advantages result?

15. In a model linkage, such as your own, what role do and should the following groups play in <u>program needs identification</u>:

    A. CETA personnel

    B. Actual/potential CETA clients or groups

    C. Community college faculty and staff

    D. Private sector personnel

    E. Political officials

16. In a model linkage such as your own, what role do and should the following groups play in program planning:

A. CETA personnel

B. Actual/potential CETA clients or groups

C. Community college faculty and staff

D. Private sector personnel

E. Political officials

17. Which of the following behavioral changes in CETA clients are most important to achieve in program implementation:

A. knowledge - organization and integration of general ideas about aspects of the world

B. understanding - awareness of self and others, and the interaction between both

C. skills - specific mastery of occupationally useful competencies

D. attitudes - predispositions to behave in a specific way

E. interests - likes and dislikes

F. values - abstractions involving evaluations of good and bad and right and wrong

18. In a model linkage, such as your own, what role do and should the following play in program administration:

A. recruitment of community college staff/faculty to administer programs

B. training of community college staff/faculty to administer programs

C. training and continuing education for CETA administrative and program personnel

D. staff development workshops involving community college faculty and CETA personnel

E. training and continuing education for other service deliverer personnel

19. In a model linkage, such as your own, what role do and should the following play in program evaluation:

A. evaluation of program content and methods

B. evaluation of program quality

C. evaluation of program facilities, supplies, equipment

D. evaluation of program placements

E. evaluation of program personnel

20. In a model linkage, such as your own, what role do and should the following groups play in <u>program evaluation</u>:

A. evaluation by CETA participants

B. evaluation by CETA prime sponsor agency (I.M.U.)

C. evaluation by outside experts

D. evaluation by CETA personnel (program planners)

E. evaluation by community college administration

F. evaluation by program personnel themselves (self-evaluation)

G. evaluation by peers (other program personnel)

21. In a model linkage, such as your own, what role does and should evaluation play in determining changes and implementing changes?

Appendix D

Interview Schedule/CETA Prime Sponsor Agency Personnel

1. With regard to question number 8 on the questionnaire, would you rank order and elaborate upon the reasons checked for the success of your programs?

2. Using your own relationship with the community college as an example, what are the factors you believe are necessary for a successful linkage between CETA and the community college?

3. How do you determine who is best to handle what program function?

4. How do you clarify and coordinate responsibility and authority?

5. What changes in the following areas of a community college are needed to meet CETA's needs?

   A. Community college personnel - for example, presidents, deans, faculty, staff, etc.

   B. Structure of the college - for example, registration, credit, "mainstreaming" of CETA students, content of course offerings, programs, curricula, etc.

   C. Delivery of content - for example, program length, accessibility, entrance, exit, etc. and especially the role of the faculty and staff.

6. What changes in the following areas of CETA are needed to meet the community college's needs?

   A. structure of CETA - organizational positions and personnel, communication patterns, style of operation, policies, contracts, etc.

   B. Content of CETA desired education and training programs

7. What are the short-term and long-term implications of your programmatic linkage system for:

   A. CETA clients

   B. Community college

   C. CETA prime sponsor agency

   D. Non-CETA students at the college

8. What changes would you make in your own model?

9. Through your relationship with the community college, how have you brought the world of work and education more closely together?

10. Do you have any data which indicates that training and educational programs offered by the local community college are more successful and cost-effective than if conducted by a local CBO?

11. What are the short-term and long-term implications of your current funding agreement with the community college?

12. In a model linkage, such as your own, what role do and should the following groups play in <u>program needs identification</u>:

   A. CETA personnel

   B. Actual/potential CETA clients or groups

   C. Community college faculty and staff

   D. Private sector personnel

   E. Political officials

13. In a model linkage, such as your own, what role do and should the following groups play in <u>program planning</u>:

A. CETA personnel

B. Actual/potential CETA clients or groups

C. Community college faculty and staff

D. Private sector personnel

E. Political officials

14. Which of the following behavioral changes in CETA clients are most important to achieve in <u>program implementation</u>:

A. knowledge - organization and interpretation of general ideas about aspects of the world

B. understanding - awareness of self and others, and the interaction between both

C. skills - specific mastery of occupationally useful competencies

D. attitudes - predispositions to behave in a specific way

E. interests - likes and dislikes

F. values - abstractions involving evaluations of good and bad and right and wrong

15. In a model linkage, such as your own, what role do and should the following play in <u>program administration</u>:

A. recruitment of community college staff/faculty to administer programs

B. training of community college staff/faculty to administer programs

C. training and continuing education for CETA administrative and program personnel

D. staff development workshops involving community college faculty and CETA personnel

E. training and continuing education for other service deliverer personnel

16. In a model linkage, such as your own, what role do and should the following play in <u>program evaluation</u>:

A. evaluation of program content and methods

B. evaluation of program quality

C. evaluation of program facilities, supplies, equipment

D. evaluation of program placements

E. evaluation of program personnel

17. In a model linkage, such as your own, what role do and should the following groups play in <u>program evaluation</u>:

A. evaluation by CETA participants

B. evaluation by CETA prime sponsor agency (I.M.U.)

C. evaluation by outside experts

D. evaluation by CETA personnel (program planners)

E. evaluation by community college administration

F. evaluation by program personnel themselves (self-evaluation)

G. evaluation by peers (other program personnel)

18. In a model linkage, such as your own, what role does and should evaluation play in determining changes and implementing changes?

Appendix E

COMAR 13.51.01.04H

July 1,1978

If State or federally funded contracts and/or grants pay for program and/or course costs, State aid may not be paid for that proportion of full-time equivalent students whose total costs are funded by the grant or contract. Colleges may make requests to the State Board for Community Colleges for specific exceptions to this policy.

Procedures:

When programs/courses are funded by State or federal contracts and/or grants, community colleges will adjust their FTE enrollment for State aid purposes by the following process:

(a) Estimate the total cost of programs/courses financed by contracts and/or grants to offer instructional programs/courses.

(1) Direct costs are those expenses that are readily identifiable with a final cost objective (program/course). For purposes of COMAR 13.51.01.04H, direct costs include compensation costs.

(2) Indirect costs are those expenses which are not readily identifiable with a final cost objective (program/course), but that can be reasonably allocated to a final cost objective (program/course) on an equitable basis. For purposes of COMAR 13.51.01.04H, indirect costs are all costs other than direct costs. Indirect costs are allocated to the program/course on the basis of credit and equated credit hours generated.

(3) Total costs are the sum of the direct and indirect costs that are identifiable with or can be reasonably allocated to a final objective (program/course).

(b) Estimate the total full-time equivalent students generated by the program/course.

(c) Determine total dollars received for the program/course from State or federally funded contracts and/or grants.

(d) Estimate total program/course costs per full-time equivalent student.

(e) Divide total State or federal aid received for that program/course by total estimated costs per estimated full-time equivalent student.

(f) Do not submit for State aid those full-time equivalent students found by dividing the State or federal aid received for that program or course by the total costs per FTE for the program/course.

(g) Adjust SBCC-CC-2 and SBCC-CC-3 enrollment reports on a current basis for estimated FTE to be eliminated from State aid by the State or federal contract or grant.

(h) Determine, through the year-end audit, the actual program/course costs and FTE generated and make subsequent year adjustment when determined necessary by the College's C.P.A. firm.

The following are programs currently excluded from COMAR 13.51.01.04H:

(1) Any State or federal student scholarship, grant, loan, or work study programs provided either directly to students or directly to institutions

(2) Veterans' cost of instruction program or G.I. Bill payments

(3) Continuing Education and Community Service - Title I grants

(4) Division of Vocational-Technical Education grants

(5) Desegregation grants

(6) Appalachian Regional Commission grants

(7) Title II - Library resources

(8) Alumni funds - Grants, gifts, and bequests

(9) Title III - Aid to developing institutions

(10) Direct payment of students' regular tuition and fees

(11) Nursing capitation grants

(12) State industrial training grants

(13) All funds donated from sources other than State and federal agencies

(14) Any portion of State or federal contract and/or grant funds designated for the purchase of equipment

15. Est. Annual Family Income

Family income shall exclude:

(a) Non-cash income, such as food stamps, or compensation received in the form of food or housing.

(b) Imputed value of owner-occupied property.

(c) Public Assistance Payments

(d) Cash payments received pursuant to a State Plan approved under Titles, I, IV, X, or XVI of the Social Security Act, or disability insurance payments received under Title II of the Social Security Act.

The payments authorized under Titles I, IV, X and XVI of the Social Security Act are:

Title I - Grants to States for Old Age Assistance and Medical Assistance to the Aged

Title IV - Grants to States for Aid and Services to Needy Families with Children

Title X - Grants to States for Aid to the Blind

Title XVI - Grants to States for Aid to the Aged, Blind or Disabled, or for such Aid and Medical Assistance for the Aged

(e) Federal, State, or local unemployment benefits.

(f) Payments made to participants in employment and training programs (including payments received under CETA Title IV or Title VIII, or Title V of the Older Americans Act) except wages paid for PSE and OJT

(g) Wages received while in a work release program

(h) Capital gains and losses

(i) One-time unearned income, such as, but not limited to:

(1) Payments received for a limited fixed term under income maintenance programs and supplemental (private) unemployment benefits plans.

(2) One-time or fixed-term scholarship and fellowship grants.

(3) Accident, health, and casualty insurance proceeds.

(4) Disability and death payments, including fixed-term (but not lifetime life insurance annuities and death benefits.

(5) One-time awards and gifts.

(6) Inheritances, including fixed-term annuities.

(7) Fixed-term workmen's compensation awards.

(8) Terminal leave pay.

(9) Soil bank payments.

(10) Agriculture crop stabilization payments.

(j) Pay or allowances previously received by any veteran while serving on active duty in the Armed Forces.

(k) Educational assistance and compensation payments to veterans and other eligible persons under Title 38, United States Code, Chapters 11, Compensation for Service-Connected Disability or Death; 18, Dependence and Indemnity Compensation for Service-Connected Death; 31 Vocational Rehabilitation; 34, Veterans' Education Assistance; 35, War Orphans' and Widows' Educational Assistance; and 36, Administration of Educational Benefits.

(l) Payments received under the Trade Readjustment Act.